DIVINE LOVE VINDICATED

H. W. SOUTHWORTH

Class 234R Book So89
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK.

PRESENTED BY
The author

Divine Love
Vindicated .

Divine Love Vindicated

By

H. W. Southworth

London

John Long, Limited

Norris Street, Haymarket

[*All Rights Reserved*

234 R
So 89

57934

First Published in 1911

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Contents

	PAGE
Not on Calvary - - - - -	11
The Faith of the Fathers - - -	43
Nazareth or Tarsus? - - - -	105

Foreword

"Ring out the old, ring in the new,
Ring out the false, ring in the true,
Ring in THE CHRIST THAT IS TO BE."

THIS volume is an attempt to exemplify the poet-seer's prophecy; for it was no mere flight of fancy that Tennyson rang out.

Yet it is no new conception of the Christ mission which these pages advocate.

They advocate the rehabilitation of the primal theory of the Christ mission; the theology of the earlier centuries of the Church which Rome displaced, because the doctrine of sacrifice on the Cross was essential as a foundation to the sacerdotal sacrifice of the Mass; for on that sacerdotalism rests all the claims of the Roman Church to divinely-bestowed priestly power.

What the Church of the earlier centuries did not believe, St Augustine shows—in his *De Trinitate*—by his *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory of the expiation on the Cross.

That theory of the mission of the Christ which the early Church recognized may be expressed briefly in the words of Justin the Martyr: "Christ served even to the slavery of the Cross" in His character of a redeemer from the dominion of Satan. Yet, through all of the writings of the early Fathers, there

seems to run an undertone of reverence for the silence of our Lord as to the manner in which His saving power was exercised — practically silence; for whatever of His utterances can be quoted in support of one theory they can be offset by those of equal force which negative that theory.

The very mysticism with which the early Fathers clothe their conceptions of the Christ mission is strong negative evidence that they had inherited from the Apostles none of those theories of atonement which the Romanized Church found essential as foundation for its claims to sacerdotal power.

To undermine that foundation of sacerdotalism, this volume is divided into three parts.

The first part is a demand that the word "Redemption" be given its true and natural meaning; and then, that the logical conclusions of such construction of its true import be recognized.

The second section is a compendium of the historical evidence that this demand is justified by the writings of the early Fathers.

In the remainder of the volume, the monotony of monologue is relieved by the weaving into the argument the personality of a man who has only a layman's knowledge of the Bible to combat a clergyman's attempt to imperil his faith in Him of Nazareth, through an exaltation of the doctrines of Saul of Tarsus.

NOT ON CALVARY

Introduction

To those whose faith is fixed and abiding this brings no message. Its appeal is only to you who have gone down into the dark valley of doubt, and cannot find your way out, because the paths seem so tortuous—the guides so conflicting.

Mayhap, this will lead you out on the other side, where—not because the atmosphere is purer, but because from another point of vision, another facet of many-sided truth flashes back the light—the old loved faith may be seen again; but resting on a foundation where is represented no Father's love incongruously blended with a stern retributive justice, that could be satisfied only by the ignominious death of the Innocent; but where the Divine Tragedy is represented as the last exercise of malignant power by the almost divine but fallen one, in that redemptive contest where our Lord literally bought back the spiritual freedom of mankind through the spiritual danger that He, girded with the weakness of the flesh, was presumed to encounter when He was led by the Spirit into the wilderness.

Not on Calvary

"God is not wisely trusted when declared unintelligible."

"Such honour, rooted in dishonour, stands;
Such faith, unfaithful, makes us falsely true."

Luke xxi. 28: "Then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh."

REDEMPTION — wonderful word! remarkable not less for the simplicity and clearness of its meaning, than for its almost universal application to one specific condition—the recovery of something once possessed, but which can be recovered only on the payment of a price.

But there is one exception to the otherwise universal acceptance of the meaning and application of the word redemption. When we enter the domain of religion, we find its simplicity lost, its clear interpretation sacrificed to the supposed necessity of maintaining the belief that the great drama of man's redemption included only the Divine personalities.

Nothing in the sharp rebukes of our Lord to the sophistries of the Pharisees exceeded His indignation at the liberties they had taken with the clear meaning of their divinely-taught

instructors. His indignation finds a ready echo in our hearts. Are we sure that we are less in error, though less in guilt, in ignoring the natural derivative force of the word redemption?

Will not the words of our blessed Lord sustain us in our attempt to re-invest His title of Redeemer with its otherwise universal meaning?

At the outset, if we attempt to use the word redemption in this universal and natural way, we must discontinue the use of misleading impersonal terms in describing the opposing interests in this great transaction of redemption; for, deprecate it as we may, the time has gone by when doubt or honest inquiry can be met with the "hush of a holy awe," or silenced with an exhortation to accept mystery as the evidence of Divine truth. Atheism and the Anti-Christ must be combated with logical arguments, and with language that is consistent and of universal application.

In the domain of religion, as in every other department of thought, consistent reasoning and accurate expression is demanded.

Does the accepted meaning of the word redemption enable us to meet the most common objections of the infidel? Of these objections take, for instance, his query—"How could the

Divinity, if it is a unity, sacrifice part of itself to itself, and was this sacrifice a sacrifice to itself as a whole or to only a part of itself? and if to a part, to what part?" And "How could such a sacrifice be demanded, and still the demand be consistent with the love and tenderness of the Divine character, of which Christ is presented as an exponent?" Or again, "If Christ was God in flesh, divinely sent on earth for a sacrifice which was to be in the form of a crucifixion in his adult years, why did He, as a child, flee into Egypt (at God's command) to avoid death at the hand of an earthly ruler?"

If we accept the crucifixion as the means of expiation, we must ignore or deny the account of His flight into Egypt; but rather let us offer the theory of our Lord's exposure to Satan's malevolence all through His life; then we can readily account for the purpose of Satan to effect the destruction by Herod of the one with whom he knew he must cope, in a struggle that might cost him his power.

In our attempt to invest the religious use of the word redemption with its natural and otherwise universal meaning, we must clearly define—

First: What was the value to be regained?
—Man's spiritual freedom.

Second: Who was its then lawful holder? —The Prince of this world.

Third: From whose original possession had it passed?—God's.

Fourth: What was the price demanded by its lawful or potent holder in return for its transfer to its original possessor?—The anticipated dominion over our Lord by His subjection to temptation through the weakness of the flesh.

Let us consider this great drama of temptation.

"Then was Jesus *led* of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the *devil*."

Let us first examine the significance of the word "led." It has much of the force of the Greek aorist; that is, its immediate action is almost put out of sight, in the consideration which the mind is called upon to give to the train of events that have brought about the captivity which makes the "leading" possible. Many illustrations of this meaning may be found in all parts of the Bible; but there is no better illustration of this force of the word "led" than in that petition which our Lord taught us, "Lead us not into temptation"; words which would be of doubtful significance if this aorist force of the word "led" did not

convey our acknowledgment of our previous subjugation and exposure to that same personality into whose power our Lord for our sakes was "led"; and so that phrase of our Lord's prayer becomes an acknowledgment of our consciousness of that malign power, and a tribute of our faith in the Father's power to strengthen us successfully to resist the power of the devil.

"Led of the spirit—*to be* tempted of the devil." If we will divest our minds of all preconceptions, can we fairly claim that this humiliation of our Lord—to which He was brought by the Spirit, in its double office of divinely co-equal consoler, and as witness of the completeness of divine surrender of divinity in the environment of the flesh, to the devil—can we fairly advance it as a plausible theory that this humiliation of divinity to the devil was only an example to us to resist evil?

Let us remember that all the knowledge we have of the events of those forty days are three incidents just at the close of the period of trial. Nor must we forget that it was this trial, not that at Gethsemane or on Calvary, which the Holy Spirit dignified with its presence. Yet these are sufficient to teach us the power of the "Prince of this world." No, only something of far deeper meaning,

of subtler force than mere example to resist evil, can reasonably account for this bitter humiliation of our Lord at the hands of the Arch Rebel—the almost divine before he fell, still almost divine in the grandeur and scope of his power.

He had induced angels to rebel even in heaven. "God's image" in the environment of flesh he had successfully tempted to evil; there remained only one possible victory,—his conquest over Divinity exposed to his power through the weakness of humanity,—and we may presume that without that victory his eventual subjugation would be complete.

Is it not more reasonable to suppose that Satan invited this last great contest, where his success meant a resuming (nay, more, an increasing) of his once almost divine power; but defeat would be a rendering back to God of the power He had given him; and so through this exposure and humiliation in the contest of our Lord with Satan, came the "buying back" of the God-given, but misused, power over man? Is not this a more tenable theory than that a loving Father demanded the sacrifice of His Son to appease His anger toward a race that had been drawn into sin by a superior sinful being whom He had created and still maintained in all his seductive

and debasing power? St Augustine, in his *De Trinitate*, exhibits the *reductio ad absurdum* of such demands of the Father.

Even if no other argument were presented to show that not in the crucifixion came man's redemption, that prayer of our Lord in Gethsemane would, unsupported, seem almost convincing: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." Surely the divinely-inspired warning to Pilate, through his wife, would never have been sent to stay the hand of the only one who could crucify our Lord, if His death was essential to our salvation.

Far from divine He would seem to have been; infinitely less heroic, even humanly speaking, than the host of martyrs who exultantly met death for His sake, He must have been; and with infinitely less faith in His own mission, if (with the knowledge that the crucifixion was the only means for man's redemption) He had appealed to the Father to permit the cup of His expiatory suffering to pass from Him.

It must have been some gain or loss of infinitely less importance than the redemption of mankind that was imminent when that appeal was made. Had it been man's redemption, and He divine, He must have known—without need of appeal—whether the

draining of the cup was unavoidable. Consequently His appeal to the Father must refer to some conditions of which He was not cognizant, because of later development than in those divine councils before He left heaven—councils in which He must then have been a participant, equal in knowledge and honour.

We find the explanation of His appeal to the Father—to show to Him the extent of His humiliation—in these words: "This is your hour and the power of darkness." In the environment of the flesh, and we may presume its consequent limitation of knowledge, it would be natural that He should appeal to the Father to learn how far His submission to the power of the devil must bring suffering and humiliation; for we may fairly infer that the devil had no settled and defined plan, but adapted his attacks upon our Lord to what seemed most effective, as events developed. So, while our Lord expected death, He clearly stated His hope that His redemptive work was already done, and it presumably seemed to Him that that which was only humiliation and suffering through the instrumentality of the "power of darkness" might be omitted, and that death in some less ignominious form might suffice.

As a co-equal member of the Godhead He

would have known, uninstructed, what were the conditions of deliberations and agreements and purposes in which Divinity was the sole participant, if crucifixion was the fore-ordained means of expiation; for our Lord must have been a participant in those divine deliberations, held before He took on Himself those limitations of the flesh which would naturally compel Him to appeal to the Father for a knowledge of the extent of demoniac demands, as they had developed after He had left heaven.

This appeal of our Lord, "Father, if it be possible," is so recognized a weakness in the common theory of expiation, that great pains have been taken to explain that it was the humanity of our Lord which was asserting itself in that crucial hour; but surely in that grand culmination of His mission the divinity would have risen superior to the flesh, if the crucifixion had been the only means for man's reconciliation with God.

How frequent are the allusions, in our Lord's last interview with His disciples, to the power of the devil: "And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot to betray him," and "After the sop Satan entered into him," and "Hereafter I will not talk much with you, for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing

in me," and "Judgment, because the prince of this world is judged"; so, too, as our Lord stood before Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then should my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews."

Why these repeated references to the agency of the devil in His crucifixion, if He was not in the power of Satan, who was to use his power to end the Life he had been unable to debase?

True, there are utterances of our Lord that can be advanced as antagonistic to this theory of redemption already accomplished.

"This is my blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

Yet may it not be that, with the suffering so imminent, He was absorbed in its contemplation, so that His thoughts were only of that, the last event in His submission to the power of Satan, and His utterances were influenced by that?

Have we not a right to give an equal force to those other words of our Lord spoken at that time: "I have finished the work that thou gavest me to do," and also, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world"? If we accept these last two expressions literally, then our Lord positively asserted that the crucifixion

was not essential to redemption, for in these He distinctly states that the redemptive work had been done, so that whatever literalness of interpretation we give either to the first or to the last two expressions we must give to all, and reconcile any seeming conflict of meaning, as in all such cases, by the preponderance of evidence. Notably that appeal to the Father that the cup might pass from Him, shows that our Lord did not regard the crucifixion as essential to redemption, only so far as His redemptive surrender to Satan must extend to the limit of His earthly life—whatever the consequences: a surrender that began in that keener suffering in the wilderness, where He endured an agony, "for the remission of sins," presumably far more bitter than in the briefer pain in which "my blood is shed"; a surrender of which the crucifixion was a result—not a complete unavoidable condition of expiation.

How often a humiliating sorrow is hidden, till at last, with some added insult, the overburdened soul can no longer be silent, and the wounded spirit compels expression; thus our Lord as He stood before Pilate. "Speakest thou not unto me?" was the contemptuous demand of Pilate. "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?"

The cup of ignominy was full, and with this added insult there came from the lips of our Lord the sorrow-wrung admission of His subjection to the power of the devil, which was to have in His crucifixion its final wreaking of otherwise impotent hate.

"Thou couldst have no power at all against me except it were given thee from *above; therefore* he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin," are words that can refer only to "the prince of this world," for there was no one else but God and Cæsar that were above Pilate, and Cæsar had no part in the divine tragedy; and "greater sin" excludes God. Let us not pass lightly the force of the connective "therefore" which couples "sin" with the *one* by whose power, higher than Pilate's, our Lord was delivered into Pilate's hands for crucifixion. That it was a power "above" Pilate, excludes its application to the Jewish tribunal which had condemned our Lord.

If these words were unsupported they would prove that for some great purpose our Lord was delivered into Satan's hands with such completeness of surrender that, practically, it was by Satan He was crucified; and Satan would not crucify Him for man's redemption; yet it would be thoroughly consistent that he should bring our Lord to a death so igno-

minious that His influence, presumably, would be destroyed.

We should not fail to recognize the significance of what our Lord omitted in that crucial hour. There was no assertion then, nor was there at any time, of the Father's sense of outraged justice, which demanded so great a sacrifice ; there was only the humiliating confession that Satan held Him in his power, Pilate being only the tool of that power—a power that we may believe was held only by our Lord's voluntary surrender, in those divine councils in which He took up the gage that Satan had given, where man's redemption or man's deeper enthralment were the prizes to be won.

Can we believe that anything less than man's redemption from Satan was the price of such surrender, in which the crucifixion was only the wreaking of vengeance, the last spiteful injury, in the chagrin of thwarted temptation ?

And what an added glory and tenderness is given to the character of our Lord, what depth of love to mankind, if, instead of surrender to the hand of a loving Father, our Lord consented to subject Himself to the tyrannical power of the devil with all the spiritual humiliation and suffering that it meant! How great that humiliation and that shameful sorrow were, we can never know till we pass into the light

His presence will give us. Till then, only the faintest type of that degradation for our sakes would be that of a pure bride with her love and his devotion just pledged, compelled to leave her husband at the altar and to go away to a fate worse than death—to consort, as our Lord did, for forty days and nights, with the lowest and vilest being, the most degraded creature that imagination can picture, but accepting her degradation to save all who were dear to her from misery and persecution at the hands of this brutal creature. And yet how seldom, if ever, we bestow a thought on that suffering so terrible and so humiliating.

There was a time when men used only the rude mode of numeration, of which the Roman notation was the perfected form. Later there came the Arabic notation, where numerical values were represented by figures. Still later there was developed the higher mathematics, and men needed no arbitrary representatives of value, but thought computations, by letters and powers.

So man has computed and measured God's love and power. First, in the Mosaic computation, where all knowledge of God had to be revealed by voice of prophet, by cloud and pillar of fire, by constant visible expression of

God's power; and through it all ran the ceaseless stream of blood.

With our Lord's personal appearance on earth there came a second period, a newer method of estimating and measuring God's love and power; far above the old Mosaic it was; far more spiritual; far more elevating—but it degenerated into a belief in His blood sacrifice, and belief in a stern deity to be appeased by blood; so like the old heathen ideas of satisfying a malignant deity, that it seemed as if men had grown so enthralled by the power of Satan that their minds could not comprehend any higher motives in Divinity than those which incited the blood sacrifices of the heathen. Yet side by side with this, strangely commingling at times, the heart pleading the love of Christ, the intellect urging the pitiless demand for justice, and in this stern demand finding the incentive to and excuse for terrible cruelties, the current of Christian thought and feeling has run on for centuries.

But the third period will bring a truer, lovelier, more consistent recognition of God's love.

To us this appreciation may not come till we enter the realm of perfect intellectual and spiritual insight, and stand in the presence of Him whose mission on earth we have so misunderstood.

Then we shall know that it was only infinite sorrow and measureless suffering with man in his enthralment by Satan—not the demand for expiatory sacrifice—that prompted the Father to accept the loving redemptive sacrifice of our Lord.

But with a more spiritual and intellectual age there will come a more logical and more thoughtful comprehension of God's plan of "buying back" the power He had given to that once glorious being, surely next to the Godhead in power, but in the pride of that power so lost to loyalty and gratitude that his grand power was used only for evil. Then he, not the heart of man, will be recognized as the source of all evil—for, if we may accept all that is taught us by analogy in everything else in God's creation, man has in no way been inherently changed, only marred, unless Satan is ultimately stronger than God, or God, in the creating of man, produced a being beyond His control.

Almost impious would be the advancing of this theory of the literal "buying back" of man's spiritual freedom, if it were brought forward to combat a settled universal faith in that theory of redemption that is commonly advanced. But doubt, which is the honest cravings of the mind for some belief more consistent

with the heart's interpretation of Divine love, a longing for a more natural explanation of the Father's acceptance of the Christ sacrifice, is appearing everywhere.

The retiring Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly (in May 1890) said:

"The number of candidates for ordination who reject some of the fundamental doctrines of our creed is said to be on the increase. Some of these do not hesitate to assail the doctrine of inspiration, our Lord's miracles, the necessity of the Atonement, and the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent."

And if in this most conservative body, there is compelled such confession of the weakening of old faiths, how common must be the revulsion to theories of divine government where the love of Christ teaches the heart, while the intellect vainly attempts to reconcile it with the union of love and severity which the blood-expiation teaches of the Father.

But it may be urged that if this theory of the redemptive mission of our Lord be true, why has it not been revealed to man? why has the truth been so long clouded?

First, because it is equally true in religious development as in every other form of mental science, or in physical research, "Seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you."

And just as an Edison was ready when the world's need of electricity had prompted research into its wonders, when the scientific thought in religion is so developed that the world stands waiting for a faith unclouded by mystery, and for a conception of redemption that is consistent with God's love, then there will come the interpreter with clear insight who, voicing the deeper truths which are seeking expression, will advocate this theory, if it is the most consistent, or reveal a wiser religious philosophy, if this will not bear the scrutiny of scientific yet reverent thought.

May we not also find an equally potent reason, in that delaying of all truth antagonistic to Satan's power, through his blinding of the intellect of man?

For in no way could Satan so influence man to evil as to persuade him that the evil in his heart is the evidence and assertion of man's independent individuality; Satan thus hiding his own personality and influence, disguising his own motive, while in place of his own malignity which demanded the humiliation of our Lord as part of the price of man's spiritual freedom, Satan teaches man of a Father whose leading characteristics are stern justice and unrelenting purpose to punish; a purpose which only the sacrifice of our Lord would appease.

And if the Father has not revealed His true attitude toward His children by direct means, yet surely we, "created in His image," may each find in his own heart the parallel of the waiting of the Father till His children shall respond to and appreciate His love; in other words, till they seek and find the true and consistent conception of that love—a love which is only love, not love mingled with a kind of justice which would only be satisfied with the punishment, not of the wicked but of one divinely innocent and good.

We may, then, fairly infer that any delay in the advance of His kingdom on earth is because He now equally waits, with a longing love that human hearts cannot appreciate, for the love that will defend His boundless love from that subtle imputation by which man is persuaded by Satan to believe that his malignity is the Father's stern severity, a severity which the heart of man does not the less revolt from, because his intellect is confused by calling it the impenetrable justice of God.

But it may be urged that it would lessen man's respect for the dignity of God, and weaken man's reverence for God's omnipotence, if we conceived of God as making terms of contest with Satan, and thus admitting that Satan had an independent power which God

must purchase back. Whereas if God had chosen He could have destroyed that power or its possessor.

But are we sure that God could destroy Satan or his power and not violate His moral nature?

Our conception of God must be limited by our power of reasoning; yet it would seem impossible that there could be a God who would take pleasure in the love and obedience of moral and mental automata in whom He inspired every thought and emotion.

On the lower plane on which we are created, we should have a repugnance to such associates. So it would seem impossible that God could be satisfied with other than independence of thought and emotion, in those He has created as His possible associates, and whose love-born obedience He desires; even though such independence carries with it the possibility of disobedience and antagonism to the Creator. So philosophized Plato—that earnest seeker after God.

Nor can we conceive it as consistent with what we may, without irreverence, call God's moral obligations, that He should make the gift of life, with all its mental endowments and moral freedom, other than an entire, unconditional gift which cannot be recalled from any being He endows with spiritual life, or its

force weakened. Hence any surrender of that divinely-bestowed power must be voluntarily made. And it would seem as if nothing short of this surrender by Satan could have been the price of our Lord's redemptive surrender to, and contest with, Satan.

But if we revolt from the idea of Divinity stooping to make terms with Satan, it is only because we have grown accustomed to—rather have persistently ignored the absurdity of the theory of—the more incongruous and repugnant mingling of divine and demoniac power which attended the tragedy of our Lord's crucifixion, if it was *not wholly* the work of Satan; for it was Satan who put it into the heart of Judas to betray our Lord; it was from Satan that Pilate received the power to crucify our Lord; our Lord admitted it was the hour of the power of darkness. There could be nothing apparently less consistent with divine dignity than that God should invite Satan to join Him, or that He should be compelled to share with Satan in the solemn preparation for that divine tragedy, in which, moreover, it is illogical to claim that Satan would have taken any part—that "Satan would cast out Satan"—in procuring that sacrifice which would overthrow his power over man, or even reconcile God to man, if the crucifixion was really the means of man's redemption.

If, then, in the light of all that the words of our Lord seem to express, we can accept the theory of malignity and evil ambition on the part of Satan, which urged him on to such desire to debase even Divinity, can we not naturally attribute to his direct constant exercise of power all the evil in the world, and consider it to be his entering in, just as he "entered into" the heart of Judas?

If, then, we can find evidence enough to convince us that Satan's "entering into" man is universal and continuous, what a naturalness it gives to the doctrine of forgiveness! Forgiveness then becomes no longer a suppression of an instinct to inflict a merited punishment on one who has done us an injury, an injury which, if it had been inflicted on another, and we were officers of justice, we should feel it our duty to punish; but instead, we can forgive: not merely suppressing punishment, as most forgiveness is, but forgiving in reality, because back of the wrong done we should recognize its real cause in Satan, who had "entered in" where the man was to blame for not guarding, but was not the real malignant offender.

So, too, when we fall into temptation (and how seldom we attach their literal meaning to those words), when we are tempted to do a wrong, our self-respect and spirit of independ-

ence would rally all our better nature to repel the entering in, if we at *heart* recognized the temptation as an attempt of a real Satanic personality to enter into us; and so we should rebel against the attempted captivity.

Then, in our hatred of Satan for his efforts to make us the sport of his moods of evil, we should be constant in our warfare against his power; and we should oppose it as intensely as we should do if he were physically visible to us, and we could look into his malignant face and hear the subtle voice that tried to debase our Lord.

And if this theory be tenable—that the constant "entering in" of Satan is the source of all moral evil—let us see if the words and acts of our Lord do not justify the belief that for evil Satan has the power to enter into the bodies and physical surroundings of men, and that Satan alone is responsible for physical suffering and the pain that results from material disorder; responsible, too, for death.

In nothing else does the heart influence the intellect so much as in the judgment which the mind gives in spiritual things; so when our Lord said, "Ought not this woman whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond?" we may consider that this woman alone, of all people who went before or

have followed her, suffered at the hands of Satan, or we will consider that our Lord thus gave us an insight into a general and universal cause of suffering.

Each one will judge of this statement—open equally to either construction—as his mind revolts from, or can accept, the theory of a loving God who can inflict suffering. Yet he who accepts this last theory, charges God with a purpose to establish His highest degree of earthly creation on so low a plane of moral motive, that suffering was needed to purify its spiritual life. We cannot conceive of God as needing such accessories to illustrate His power.

Let us then consider the evident spirit of our Lord's miracles, and see what is the broader lesson which they teach.

"Jesus wept." If death came to Lazarus at a time and under conditions that God had chosen as the best that a loving Father could choose, why did Jesus restore him to life? Why did He weep? It cannot be said that He wept for the bereaved sisters, for He knew that in a short time their sorrow would be turned to keenest joy, in the restoration of that life—life that would not have been even temporarily suspended "if Thou hadst been here." Is it not a higher as well as more logical conception of His emotion, to accept

the broader view, that for all humanity He wept, because it was in the power of Satan to bring the pain of bereavement to all mankind?

So, too, when He healed the sick, was He interfering with a divine plan of discipline through suffering?

Surely we must discover, for His and our own promptings to relieve suffering, some other motive than to interfere with divinely-sent pain which God intends as a needed discipline to creatures whom He has purposely made so weak that they require such discipline; a discipline that experience tells us may strengthen the few who are spiritually robust, but to the many, the weak, brings doubt and indifference, if not positive antagonism to God.

Far more consistent is the Mohammedan, who, when the pestilence comes, does not even attempt sanitary alleviations, but with "It is written," resigns himself to the, believed, will of God, and allows the plague to follow the path that he considers God has marked out for it.

If, then, we read the words and personal history of our Lord in the light of this theory—that God is loving and conserving only, not destructive and sternly seeking cause for punishment—in how much we shall find a new meaning; how much with a meaning that we

have passed over as extravagant and only figurative, instead of accepting it as literally and sadly true.

Take for instance those mournful admissions of our Lord: "The Prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me," and "My kingdom is not of this world." What indisputable evidence are these admissions of the malignant power of Satan in this world; yet they do not fit in with our preconceived theories, and so in the future, as in the past, we will consider these as extravagant expressions of our Lord, and continue to give them only a semblance of belief. For in no way could we do more faithful service to Satan than by ignoring his princeship for evil, and in our continuing to maintain that God rules with the contradictory attributes of deepest love, yet bringing suffering and bereavement to creatures whom He purposely created with affinity for sin, then gave them into the power of one who had been able to seduce even angels in heaven; yet not content with the suffering of the divinely innocent for their sakes, must continue to send pain and bereavement to discipline them.

If we could only recognize how our Lord waits to be *believed;* waits to have His words that describe Satan's power on earth no longer considered as hyperbole but terrible truth—and

in the light of that truth that we should logically weigh the probable results of such princeship of Satan—then how thoroughly our conception of Satan's malignity would bring to us a new view of the authorship of pain and death.

If Satan were so unmasked, in this full abiding conviction of his evil intent, how greatly would his princeship be deprived of its power, in our constant guarding against one who may be recognized as the source of all pain, all suffering, and of all evil intent on the part of our fellow-man, and of all derangements of the physical universe that bring suffering.

Then, too, in the new and perfect welcome that we should thus give to God, He would enter in and repossess Himself of that kingdom on earth, which can never have a real welcome for Him, which can never be His "bought-back" possession, so long as man believes that from Him comes pain or sorrow, or the allowing of sin to exist for some wise but obscure purpose.

To what a higher plane, then, will the discipline of suffering be brought, when we believe that in all suffering God is never the cause of suffering, but suffers with us!

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS

Introduction

If in the impartial presentation of evidence to prove what were the intellectual, the ethical, and the theological conditions of the period that produced the monk Anselm and his brilliant advocacy of the necessity of the Christ sacrifice to appease the justice of God, it becomes necessary to reproduce some of the dark pages of ecclesiastical history, it is with profound regret that in no other way could the condition of that period be fully understood; and only when the force of those conditions is fully comprehended can we make a just estimate of that great scholastic and his dogma. Yet, essential as they are, the compiler * of these pages would not present those sad records, did he not believe that a full knowledge of the degradation of religion, to which that dogma led, would bring nearer the day when the Universal Church will no longer permit itself to be manacled to a dead and ignoble past, but will be free to restore again

"The Faith of the Fathers."

* The compiler has availed himself of the careful studies of Professor John W. Draper, LL.D., whose *Intellectual Development of Europe* is largely quoted from.

The Faith of the Fathers

A Consensus of Historical Evidence

"The Church was purer in her younger days,
Ere the world yet smiled upon her."

"Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

THE GREAT SCHOLASTIC

It would be a grave omission, in attempting to write the history of any great movement, if we did not carefully depict the moral and intellectual conditions of the period that gave it prominence. True as it is of any phase of merely intellectual development, it becomes a paramount necessity, when a moral and religious philosophy is presented, that we should accurately describe the influences of the century in which it culminated. Only in this light can we give to such a philosophy a just and proper consideration.

The eleventh century found the Church of Christ sunken to the level of an ambitious despotism, unable to cope with the surrounding moral degradation that everywhere abounded.

The countries of Europe presented to the student of history a vast scene of rapine and plunder, usurpation and anarchy. Into this conflict and carnage there entered with lofty assertions the pretended vicar of Christ—a usurped office already disgraced by infamy and lust. No pages of court history reveal more revolting scenes than we find in the history of those pontiffs that affected to exalt themselves above the majesty of kings.

After a shocking but nevertheless truthful account of the disgraceful condition of the Papal court in the tenth century, Prof. Draper writes:—

Volume i. chapter xii. page 381.

"John XIII. was strangled in prison; Boniface VII. imprisoned Benedict VII., and killed him by starvation; John XIV. was secretly put to death in the dungeons of the Castle of St Angelo, and the corpse of Boniface was dragged by the populace through the streets. In Rome the sentiment of reverence for the supreme pontiff, nay even of respect, had become extinct. Throughout Europe the clergy were so shocked at the state of things that, in their indignation, they began to look with favour on the intention of the Emperor Otho to take from the Italians the privilege of appointing the successor of St Peter, and to limit it to his own family. But his kinsman, Gregory V.,

whom he placed on the pontifical throne, was soon compelled by the Romans to fly; his excommunications and religious thunders were turned by them into derision; they were too well acquainted with the true nature of those terrors; they were living behind the scenes.

"A terrible punishment awaited the anti-pope, John XVI. Otho returned into Italy, seized him, put out his eyes, cut off his nose and tongue, and sent him through the streets mounted on an ass, with his face toward the tail and with a wine-bladder on his head.

"It seemed impossible that things could be worse; yet Rome had still to see Benedict IX., A.D. 1033, a boy of less than twelve years, raised to the Apostolic throne. Of this pontiff, one of his successors, Victor III., declared that his life was shameful; so foul, so execrable, that he shuddered to describe it. He ruled like a captain of banditti rather than as a prelate. At last the people, unable any longer to bear his lasciviousness, homicides and abominations, rose against him. In despair of maintaining his position he put up the Papacy at auction. It was bought by a presbyter named John, who became Gregory VI., A.D. 1045.

"More than a thousand years had elapsed since the birth of our Saviour, and such was the

condition of Rome. Well may the historians shut the annals of those times in disgust; well may the heart of the Christian sink within him at such a catalogue of hideous crimes. Well may he ask: 'Were these the representatives of God upon earth—these, who have truly reached that goal beyond which the last effort of human wickedness cannot pass?'"

Urban II., a French pope, instituted the first of the Crusades, thereby adding much to the power of the Papacy. But this so-called Holy War is sullied by such a record as the following:—

Draper, volume ii. chapter i. page 23.

"But in the capture by the Crusaders, the brains of young children were dashed against the wall; infants were thrown over the battlements; every woman that could be seized was violated; men were roasted by fires; some were ripped open to see if they had swallowed gold; the Jews were driven into their synagogue and there burnt; a massacre of nearly 70,000 persons took place, and the Pope's legate was seen partaking in the triumph."

Had we need of further evidence of the condition of Ecclesiasticism in the century that produced Anselm, we might recall that then was first established the dogma of Transubstantiation. The refusal to accept this dogma

constituted the offence for which, in the reign of Queen Mary alone, hundreds of Protestants were burned at the stake.

True, this dogma was suggested at the Seventh General Council, held at Nice in 787; but it met with no welcome; and though revived in 831 by Paschaise Radbert, an obscure monk, the Church received it with mingled horror and ridicule. Berenger of Tours met it with pungent sarcasm, and Raban Maur, Archbishop of Mentz, counted by some among the Fathers, denounced it as "an error and a novelty."

It remained for the period that gave birth to Anselm's vindication of the satisfaction theory, to sanction by Papal authority, Leo IX., this blood-stained dogma of the Material Presence.

This state of affairs in the ecclesiastical world reflected a condition even worse in the social life of the people. The peasants were little more than serfs, and the feudal lords were the worst of despots. A vile fetichism of factitious relics, that were working pretended miracles in all directions, constituted the individual piety. Even the ordinary religious life was no better. Ecclesiastical preferments, bishoprics, benefices, etc., were generally bought and sold. Simony,

in short, was openly justified. In Normandy the clergy were as a whole "rude, ignorant and self-indulgent to a degree that was monstrous and intolerable." In the midst of all this there arose a Norman monastery, by far superior to any religious institution of that perverse age, the House of Bec. It was founded by a hermit soldier, Herlwin by name, and was first made famous by Lanfranc, who afterwards, in the reign of William the Conqueror, was the spiritual father of England. To this monastery, for the purpose of study, there came a youth of varied life and diverse fortunes.

Dean Church, *Life of Anselm*, page 22.

He was born at Aosta, in Piedmont, in 1033. His home life, owing to the brutality of his father, was not happy. But his mother, a devout and godly woman, made a deep impression upon his passive nature.

Monastic life attracted him from the first, but in consequence of his father's refusal to permit him to enter upon it, he strayed off into a worldly life, in which there was much of licentiousness. After his mother's death he left home and wandered through Burgundy and France. Lanfranc attracted him to Bec, and shortly afterward he assumed the monastic vows (1060), devoting himself to the study of that abstruse philosophical theology that made

him the father of modern scholasticism. The superiority of his mind soon made itself felt, and he succeeded Lanfranc as Prior of Bec in 1063, when the latter was promoted to the Abbacy of Caen. On the death of Herlwin (1078) he became Abbot. For fifteen years he remained in this position, becoming widely renowned for austerity and intellectual acumen. Here he wrote the Monologion and Prologion—apologies for the Christian religion.

Bec flourished and acquired property even in England, so the Abbot Anselm must go thither to attend to the interests of his monastery. The intercourse with that country, then begun, ended with his being almost compelled to accept the Archbishopric of Canterbury from the hands of that villainous prince, rough-handed William Rufus, then very ill and doubtful of his recovery. With that King and his successor (Henry) Anselm waged an almost continual contest, which ended, in Henry's reign, by the formal acknowledgment of the Papal power in England. During this time he was more than once an exile from the land. It was while sojourning at the village of Schlavia, that he wrote his *Cur Deus Homo* (Why God Became Man), with which we are chiefly concerned; for therein he developed the judicial theory of the Atonement.

Anselm may with justice be called the flower of mediæval monasticism. His character was the purest: with bravery and heroic devotion he sought to serve God through the Pope, whom he sincerely believed to be His representative. His greatest apologist, however, tells us that he was a "monk of monks, a dogmatist of the dogmatists, powerful and severe in mind, stern in individual life," yet he did not escape the evil influences of his age, though in some respects far superior to them. He died on the 21st of April 1109. His infirmity and fatal illness were the results of a torturing asceticism. It is but natural that one who believed that God delights in such self-torture would also agree to that intellectual and legal doctrine of the Atonement which he advocated.

Church's *Life of Anselm*, page 96.

Dean Hook concludes his life of Anselm by the statement (in substance) that they will praise him most effectively who see in his life both the evil and the good. We may praise him then for his heroism, his virtue, and his sincerity; but we must not forget that it was he who first forced free England to submit to the galling yoke of Papal usurpation, and saddled upon the theological world a harsh and repugnant conception of a bloody, cruel and avenging God, who could find judicial satisfac-

tion in the shedding of the innocent blood of His Son. The intellectual efforts of St Anselm and the other schoolmen amounted to little more than quibbling. There were no great doctrinal controversies at the time, and their hair-splitting discussions, chiefly in a circle, were in reality only a by-play with intellectual weapons. Milman says that "of those vast monuments of theology which amaze and appal the mind the sole remnant is barren amazement."

Latin Christianity, vol. ix. page 118.

Draper, vol. i. page 13.

"We have just cause to expect little of permanent value from this source, since history, criticism and science were almost unknown. Latin was the language of scholars, while Greek was hardly studied, a fact especially unfortunate since the early Greek Fathers were—without an exception—the best theologians."

But in the analysis of his character and of his doctrine, let us not forget the lesson that a comprehensive study of the history of Christianity teaches. For however much we may admire the purity of motive of the "Puritans" of any age, the men who have heroically come out from the low moral conditions into which the Christianity of their age had fallen, let us not fail to recognize the always attendant conditions. For on the higher plane to which they rose, the atmosphere was as cold as it was pure, and

in every instance they advocated theories that presented a hard and unlovely representation of God's character; theories that later generations—with no less purity, but with a truer appreciation of God's love—rejected. Lauding the noble heroism and self-denial, let us recognize the universal tendency of such reformers to attribute to God the same stern condemnation of the sinner that they exhibited in their own lives—lives that were made incapable of charitable judgment, through asceticism.

THE WITNESS OF THE FATHERS

Of what importance or value are the works of those who have been called the Fathers of the Church? Their writings are not inspired; yet because of this there are many who, while they look upon certain modern writers as little short of infallible, utterly despise an appeal to the primitive authorities.

These zealous Christian authors, often disciples of the Apostles—in many cases themselves martyrs and confessors—are worthy of attention; and, whereas they wrote before the days of later controversy, may fairly be regarded as unbiased witnesses, and become almost complementary to the inspired Word. They were human, however, and in some things disagreed among themselves; but they were diligent students of Holy Writ: indeed, to such an extent that the New Testament, if lost, could almost be restored through the quotations they made from it. Moreover, it is upon their authority that we accept certain writings as canonical and inspired.

And while much which they have written seems on the borderland of mysticism, was

largely influenced by that Eastern mode of thought that delights in an involved method of reasoning and in subtle distinctions, still they were too closely held by the faith as they had received it to permit themselves to advocate such error as was reserved for Anselm—so far removed from the period of our Lord's immediate witnesses—to promulgate.

Yet no one who analyses their mode of thought can for a moment doubt that, if any authority had been given them to advocate the satisfaction theory, the early Christian writers would have been irresistibly attracted by its subtle mysticism.

Let us observe how positive was their assertion of the constant active malignity of Satan. How constant, too, their reference to the antagonism of Satan to our Lord while on earth.

Let us then value their testimony, and regard as of especial value the writings of the heroic Christians of the first three hundred years of the Church's life, while persecution made it hold fast to the faith delivered to it, and before it had been secularized by the sanction of worldly power.

How thoroughly contrary was the theory of the ascetic Anselm to the teachings of the Fathers, we shall now attempt to establish,

asking the reader to carefully observe how often the words "redeem" and "ransom" are used where "expiation" would have found a place if the blood-sacrifice of the Christ had been in their minds.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

A.D. 60-160

LET us now essay a definition of the term: "Confined to those who are known or may reasonably be presumed to have associated with and derived their teaching directly from some Apostle."

Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. p. 147.

ST CLEMENT OF ROME, who lived at the close of the first century, was one of the first Bishops of Rome, if not the first. He is supposed by many to be the Clement named by St Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 3). He was the writer of a letter to the Corinthian Church, and addresses them as the authoritative representative of the Roman brethren. His letter is devoted almost wholly to Church dissensions at Corinth, and there is hardly any reference in it to doctrinal matters. He speaks incidentally of death having come into the world through unrighteous and ungodly jealousy on the part of Satan, and of "the blood of Christ as being precious unto the Father and as winning the grace of repentance for the whole world." Speaking of the Father and Maker of the whole world, he says: "Let us note how free He is from

St Clement, 1st Epistle, sec. 19.

anger toward all His creatures." Again, he calls "Jesus Christ the High Priest of our offerings, the guardian and helper of our weakness." In all, then, that concerns the Atonement, St Clement's writings in no way convey the idea of a mediatorial sacrifice in the person of our Lord.

St Ignatius (A.D. 70-107) was the second Bishop of Antioch. The story of his life, as known to us, begins and ends with the events connected with his martyrdom. He wrote six epistles to as many churches, while on his way to a brutal death at Rome, being selected for martyrdom as the representative of the church at Antioch. His other letter was written to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. In his Epistle to the Ephesians (sec. 16) he declares that Christ was crucified for the sake of the faith of God. (Sec. 19): "And hidden from the Prince of this world were the virginity of Mary and her child-bearing, and likewise also the death of the Lord"—as if he, Satan, had been kept in ignorance and knew not that he was putting to death the Son of God.

In the account of his martyrdom (sec. 2) Ignatius is said to have called Christ "Him who crucified my sin with him (Satan) who was the inventor of it, and who has condemned and

cast down all the deceit and malice of the devil under the feet of those who carry Him (our Lord) in their hearts."

ST BARNABAS (A.D. 120).—He speaks of Christ as the scapegoat, and that He was accursed of the people, not of God. He makes Christ appear unto God for the people as the outstretched arms of Moses made Israel victorious, and also makes the brazen serpent and the sacrifice of Isaac a type of his own crucifixion.*

General Epistle, Sec. 7.

(Sec. 4): "But He was made manifest, in order that at the time they might be perfected in their sins, and we might receive the covenant through Him who inherited it, even the Lord Jesus, who was prepared beforehand hereunto,

* In considering this figure of a scapegoat, as used by St Barnabas, let us remember that the sacrificial exposure of the scapegoat was a fitting type of our Lord's sacrificial exposure to Satan in the wilderness.

The blood that was shed before the scapegoat was led away was in purification of the priest; but the sin-bearer for the people was the goat, which was not merely taken out of sight, but was led so far into the wilderness that death from starvation or wild beasts was imminent. It would seem as if no more expressive type of the value of our Lord's exposure to Satan in the wilderness, as a ransom for the world, could be presented.

Then again, in St Polycarp's reference to the type of "the sacrifice of Isaac," we cannot do exact justice to this figure unless we recall that the divine demand was only for a *surrender, not a blood sacrifice;* and it is only a fair inference that the demand for the blood sacrifice of our Lord was not from Him who stayed the sacrificial knife of Abraham.

that appearing in person He might redeem out of darkness our hearts, which had already been paid over unto death and delivered up to the iniquity of error, and thus establish the covenant in us through the Word." Again, "We perceive then whence we were ransomed." (Sec. 15.) In interpreting a prophecy he finds that certain things had been promised: "When His Son shall come and shall abolish the time (of control) of the Lawless One."

The Shepherd of Hermas (about A.D. 140). —This writing was for a long time received as one of the canonical books. In mandate the ninth he writes: "For God is not as men who bear a grudge, but Himself is without malice and hath compassion on His creatures." In a parable our forgiveness is said to have been obtained by the labours and teachings of the Son of God: "And the Son placed the Angels in charge of them to watch over them; and the Son Himself cleansed their sins by labouring much and enduring many toils; for no one can dig without toil and labour. Having Himself then cleansed the sins of His people, He showed them the paths of life, giving them the law which He received from His Father."

Fifth Parable, Sec. 6.

The last writing of this period is the Epistle to Diognetus, though it is not possible to learn

its exact date or to identify its author. It is important, since it shows that there was no demand for judicial satisfaction.

(Epistle to Diognetus, secs. 8 and 9): "For God the Master and Creator of the universe, Who made all things and arranged them in order, was found to be not only friendly to men, but also long-suffering.

"And such, indeed, He was always and is and will be, kindly and good and dispassionate and true, and He alone is Good. And having conceived a great and unutterable scheme, He communicated it to His Son alone. For so long as He kept and guarded His wise design as a mystery, He seemed to neglect us and to be careless about us.

"But when He revealed it through His beloved son, and manifested the purpose which He had prepared from the beginning, He gave us all these gifts at once, participation in His benefits, and sight and understanding (of mysteries), which none of us ever would have expected."

"Having thus planned everything already in His mind with His Son, He permitted us during the former time to be borne along by disorderly impulses as we desired; led astray by pleasures and lusts, not at all because He took delight in our sins, but because He bore with us; not because He approved of the past

season of iniquity, but because He was creating the present season of righteousness that, being convinced in the past by our own deeds as unworthy of life, we might now be made deserving by the goodness of God; and having made clear our inability to enter into the kingdom of God of ourselves, might be enabled by the ability of God.

"And when our iniquity had been fully accomplished, and it had been made perfectly manifest that punishment and death were expected as its recompense, and the season came which God had ordained, when henceforth He should manifest His goodness and power (the exceeding great kindness and love of God), He hated us not, neither rejected us nor bore us malice, but was long-suffering and patient, and in pity for us took upon Himself our sins, and Himself *parted with His Son as a ransom for us*, the holy for the lawless, the guileless for the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal."

ANTE-NICENE FATHERS

A.D. 100 TO GENERAL COUNCIL OF NICCÆA, 325

JUSTIN THE MARTYR (A.D. 114-165).—He was an educated layman of the early Church, who proved one of the ablest apologists of the period and did much to attract philosophers and learned men to the Church. Of him one of the ancients (Methodius) says: "A man who was not far separated from the Apostles either in age or in excellence." He believes and demonstrates that in the forty days in the wilderness, and in the temptations immediately following, "there was done away with that infringement of God's command which had occurred in Adam."

In his Second Apology we read (chap. v.): "God, when He had made the whole world, committed the care of men and of all things under Heaven to angels whom He appointed over them. But the angels transgressed this appointment." (Chap. viii.): "The devils have always effected that all those who anyhow live a reasonable and earnest life and shun vice be hated."

(Chap. xi.): "We should not be put to death nor would wicked men and devils be more powerful than we, were not death a debt due by every man that is born." In his discussions with the Jew Trypho (*Dialogues*), without attempting to construct any theory, he incidentally refutes the mediæval doctrine. Referring to the Jewish sacrifices, he says: "He neither takes sacrifices from you nor commanded them at first to be offered because they are needful to Him, but because of your sins," evidently meaning that a purer form of sacrifice was demanded of them, that their readiness to adopt heathen sacrifices might be checked.

(Chap. xli. 1): "And the offering of fine flours, sirs, I said, which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist; the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed in remembrance of the suffering which He endured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from iniquity, in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world with all things therein for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and *for utterly overthrowing principalities and powers by Him who suffered* according to His will."

(Chap. xciii.): "More than this, you

suppose that He (Christ) was crucified as hostile to you and cursed by God; which supposition is the product of your most irrational mind."

(Chap. xciv.): "He produced the mystery by which He declared that He would break the power of the serpent which occasioned the transgression of Adam, and would bring to them that believe on Him (who was foreshadowed) by this sign, *i.e.*, Him who was to be crucified, salvation from the fangs of the serpent."

"Just as God commanded the sign to be made by the brazen serpent, and yet he is blameless, even so, though a curse lies in the law against persons who are crucified, yet no curse lies on the Christ of God, by whom all that have committed things worthy of a curse are saved."

He does not understand St Paul to mean (Gal. iii. 13) that Christ was cursed of God; for he writes (chap. xcvi.): "For the statement in the law, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,' confirms our hope which depends on the crucified Christ, not because He who has been crucified is cursed by God, but because God foretold that which would be done by you all, and by those like to you, who do not know that this is He who existed

before all; who is the eternal priest of God, and King, and Christ." In other words, Christ was accursed by the Jews, and not cursed by God as being a sin-bearer on the cross.

In another place he translates the prophecy of Isaiah from the Septuagint: "The discipline (paideia—not chastisement) of our peace was upon Him."

Speaking of the temptation he writes (chap. cxxv.): "Accordingly the name Israel signifies this: A man who overcomes power; for Isra is a man overcoming and El is power. And that Christ would act so when He became man, was foretold by the mystery of Jacob's wrestling with Him who appeared to him, in that He ministered to the will of the Father, yet nevertheless is God, in that He is the first-begotten of all creatures. For when He became man, as I previously remarked, the devil came to Him, *i.e.*, that power which is called the serpent and Satan—tempting Him and striving to effect His downfall by asking Him to worship him. But He destroyed and overthrew the devil, having proved him to be wicked, in that he asked to be worshipped as God, contrary to the Scripture; who is an apostate from the will of God. For He answers him: 'It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'

Then overcome and convicted, the devil departed at that time."

Again, an important passage is found in chap. cxxxiv.: "Jacob served Laban for speckled and many-spotted sheep; and Christ served even to the slavery of the Cross, for the various and many-formed races of mankind, acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the Cross." *

St Irenæus (A.D. 120-202). — A valiant soldier of the faith. He was a pupil of Polycarp — who was a pupil of St John the Evangelist—and after becoming a presbyter

* If, then, we are inclined to give favourable consideration to the only tenable reason for "Then was Jesus led of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil"; if we desire to study why there was such leading, such surrender to the "slavery" which Justin the Martyr names, it will be natural if we go further and ask, "What were the considerations —on either side—for this 'slavery' into which our Lord was inducted by the Holy Spirit?"

The prevailing theology stultifies itself, and should forfeit our respect, because it purposely ignores this awful suffering of our Lord; ignores, too, all the pain and humiliation which, throughout His life, seems to be the direct outcome of that "slavery" to the devil.

But as soon as we rise superior to that theology, and justly give weight to this momentous feature of our Lord's mission on earth, there naturally follows the inquiry, "What did our Lord receive in return for this humiliating slavery?"

Satan had seduced angels in heaven; he had debased man, made in God's image; it was most natural that he should offer a contest in which he risked his power as "Prince of this world" in return for opportunity to tempt to sin (as he did try to tempt) God endued with, and so made vulnerable by, the weakness of human nature.

he is sent to labour with a fellow-student, Pothinus, then Bishop of Lyons (Gaul). Afterwards he was sent to Rome to condemn certain heresies, but found, on reaching the Imperial City, that the Bishop of Rome and an old friend had embraced respectively the Montanist and Valentinian heresies. Saddened in heart, he returned to Lyons only to find that a martyr's death had claimed the holy Pothinus, and naturally he was called upon to succeed him (A.D. 177). Faithfully he laboured to evangelize Southern Gaul, and sent missionaries to what we now call France. He did more than this, for with his pen he effectively contended against the enemies of the faith, and in doing so expressed himself in plainer words than any of his predecessors.

His teaching was almost universally accepted, for nearly a thousand years, as being next to inspired. A recent American editor declares that his work "*Against Heresies* is one of the most precious remains of early Christian antiquity." It is devoted, on the one hand, to an account of those multiform Gnostic heresies which prevailed in the latter half of the second century; and, on the other hand, to an exposition and defence of the Christian faith. We quote (book iii. chap. xviii. 6): "He (Christ) fought and conquered, for He

was a man contending for the Fathers,* and through obedience doing away with disobedience completely, for He bound the strong man and set free the weak, and endowed His own handiwork with salvation by destroying sin. For He is a most holy and merciful Lord and loves the human race."

(7.) "Therefore, as I have already said, He caused man (through His divine incarnation) to cleave to and to become one with God. For unless man had overcome the enemy of man, the enemy would not have been legitimately vanquished. And again, unless it had been God who had already given salvation, we could never have possessed it securely. And unless man had been joined to God he could never have become a partaker of incorruptibility. For it was incumbent upon the mediator between God and man, by His relationship to both, to bring forth friendship and concord, and to present man to God while He revealed God to man. For in what way could we be partakers of the adoption of sons unless we had received from Him through the Son that fellowship which refers to Himself, unless His Word, having been made flesh, had entered into communion with us? Wherefore also He passed through every state of

* Meaning the Jewish Patriarchs.

life, restoring communion with God to all."

(Book v. chap. i.): "The mighty Word and very Man who, redeeming us by His own blood in a manner consonant to reason, *gave Himself as a ransom for those who had been led into captivity.* And since the apostasy tyrannized over us unjustly, and though we were by nature the property of the omnipotent God, alienated us contrary to nature, rendering us its own disciples, the Word of God powerful in all things and not defective with regard to His own justice, did righteously turn against that apostasy, and *buy back from it His own property;* not by violent means—as the apostasy had obtained dominion over us at the beginning when it insatiably snatched away what was not its own—but by means of persuasion as became a God of counsel, who does not use violent means to obtain what He desires; so that neither should justice be infringed upon nor the ancient handiwork of God go to destruction. Since the Lord thus has redeemed us through His own blood, giving His soul for our souls, and His flesh for our flesh, and has also poured out the spirit of the Father for the union and communion of God and man, imparting, indeed, God to men by means of the spirit, and, on the other hand, attaching man to God by His

own incarnation, and bestowing on us at His coming immortality durably and truly by means of communion with God."

"The advent, therefore, of Him whom these men represent as coming to the things of others, was not righteous nor did He truly redeem us by His own blood if He did not really become man, restoring to His own handiwork what was said (of it) in the beginning, that man was made after the image and likeness of God; and not snatching away by stratagem the property of another, but taking possession of His own in a righteous and gracious manner. As far as concerned the apostasy, indeed, He redeems us righteously from it by His own blood, but as regards us who have been redeemed (He does this) graciously. For we have given nothing to Him previously, nor does He desire anything from us as if He stood in need of it; but we do stand in need of fellowship with Him. And for this reason it was that He graciously poured Himself out, that He might gather us into the bosom of the Father."

Again He emphatically declares (book v. chap. xxi.): "For indeed the enemy would not have been fairly vanquished unless it had been a man born of a woman who conquered him. For it was by means of a woman that he got the advantage over man at first, setting

himself up as a man's opponent. And therefore does the Lord profess Himself to be the Son of Man, comprising in Himself that original man out of whom the woman was fashioned (*Ex quo ea quæ secundum mulierem est plasmatio facta est*), in order that, as our species went down to death through a vanquished man, so we may ascend to life again through a victorious one; and as through a man, death received the palm (of victory) against us, so again by a man we may receive the palm against death."

Sec. 2 of the same chapter is most important, since it gives the account of the temptation, which we quote at length. "Now the Lord would not have recapitulated in Himself that ancient and primary enmity against the serpent —fulfilling the promise of the Creator (Demiurgi), and performing His command—if He had come from another Father. But as He is one and the same who formed us at the beginning and sent His Son at the end, the Lord did perform His command by being made of a woman, by both destroying our adversary and perfecting man after the image and likeness of God, and for this reason He did not draw the means of confounding him from any other source than from the words of the law: and made use of the Father's commandment as a help towards the destruction and confusion of

the apostate angel. Fasting forty days, like Moses and Elias, He afterwards hungered; first, in order that we may perceive that He was a real and substantial man—for it belongs to man to suffer hunger when fasting; and secondly, that His opponent might have an opportunity of attacking Him.

"For as at the beginning it was by means of food that the enemy persuaded man, although not suffering hunger, to transgress God's commandments, so in the end, he did not succeed in persuading him that was an hungered to take that food which proceeded from God. For when tempting Him, he said, 'If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.' But the Lord repulsed him by the commandment of the law, saying, 'It is written, man doth not live by bread alone.' As to those words (of His enemy), 'If Thou be the Son of God,' the Lord made no remark, but thus acknowledging His human nature, He baffled His adversary and exhausted the force of his first attack by means of His Father's word. The corruption of man, therefore, that occurred in Paradise by both of our first parents eating, was done away with by the Lord's want of food in this world.

"But he, being thus vanquished by the law, endeavoured again to make an assault by him-

self quoting a commandment of the law. For bringing Him to the highest pinnacle of the temple, he said to Him: 'If Thou art the Son of God, cast Thyself down. For it is written that God shall give His angels charge concerning Thee, and in their hands they shall bear Thee up, lest perchance Thou dash Thy foot against a stone;' thus concealing a falsehood under the guise of Scripture, as is done by all the heretics. For that was indeed written, namely, 'That He hath given His angels charge concerning Him'; but 'cast Thyself down from hence' no Scripture said in reference to Him. This kind of persuasion the devil produced from himself. The Lord therefore confuted him out of the law when He said: 'It is written again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' Pointing out, by the word contained in the law, that which is the duty of man, that he should not tempt God; and in regard to Himself—since He appeared in human form—declaring that He would not tempt the Lord His God.

"The pride of reason, therefore, which was in the serpent, was put to nought by the humility found in the man (Christ), and now twice was the devil conquered from Scripture when he was detected as advising things contrary to God's commandment, and was shown to be the enemy of God, by the expression of his thoughts.

He then having been thus signally defeated, and then, as it were, concentrating his forces, drawing up in order all his available power for falsehood in the third place, 'showed Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; saying,' as St Luke relates, 'All these will I give Thee, for they are delivered to me.' The Lord, then, exposing him in his true character, says: 'Depart thou, Satan; for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve.' He both revealed Satan by this name, and showed at the same time who He Himself was. For the Hebrew word 'Satan' signifies an apostate. And thus vanquishing him for the third time, He spurned him from Him finally as being conquered out of the law, and *there was done away with that infringement of God's commandment that had occurred in Adam*, by means of the precept of the law which the Son of man observed, who did not transgress the commandment of God."

(Chap. xxii. Sec. 1): "By means of the statement of the law He put our adversary to utter confusion."

(Chap. xxiv. Sec. 4): "The devil being one among those angels who are placed over the Spirit of the air, as the Apostle Paul has declared in his Epistle to the Ephesians, becoming

envious of man, was rendered an apostate from the divine law, for envy is a thing foreign to God. And as his apostasy was exposed by man (our Lord incarnate), and man became the means of searching out his thoughts (*et examinatio sententiæ ejus homo factus est*), he has set himself to this with greater and greater determination in opposition to man, envying his life and wishing to involve him in his apostate power. The Word of God, however, the Maker of all things, conquering him by no means of human nature, and showing him to be apostate, has, on the contrary, put him under the power of man."

(Book iii. chap. xxiii. Sec. 1): "For if man, who had been created by God that he might live, after losing his life through being injured by the serpent that had corrupted him, should not any more return to life, but should be utterly and for ever abandoned to death, God would (in that case) have been conquered, and the wickedness of the serpent would have prevailed over the will of God."

Neander's *Church History*, vol. ii. p. 385.

In conclusion, we quote from the words of Neander, who, speaking of the teachings of St Irenæus, says: "Of a satisfaction paid by the sufferings of Christ to the Divine Justice not the slightest mention is as yet to be found."

St Clement of Alexandria (a.d. 153-217).—He was an educated Athenian who, accepting Christ, became a teacher, and was the forerunner of that great Alexandrian School of which Origen may more properly be called the founder. He does not add much to what has already been quoted, but the following paragraphs bear upon our subject :—

Exhortation to the Heathen, chap. x. "Assuming the character of man and fashioning Himself in the flesh, He enacted the drama of human salvation ; for He was a true champion and a fellow-champion with the creature."

(Chap. xi.) : "The first man when he was in Paradise sported free because he was the child of God, but when he succumbed to pleasure (for the serpent allegorically signifies pleasure) he was a child seduced by lusts, and grew old in disobedience, and by disobeying his Father dishonoured God. Such was the influence of pleasure. Man, that had been free, by reason of simplicity, was found fettered to sins. The Lord then wished to release him from his bonds, and clothing Himself with flesh—O divine mystery!—vanquished the serpent and enslaved the tyrant, death ; and most marvellous of all, man that had been deceived by pleasure and bound fast by corruption had his hands unloosed and was set free. O mystic Wonder!

The Lord was laid low and man rose up, and he that fell from Paradise received as the reward of obedience something greater than Paradise, namely, Heaven itself."

Tertullian (A.D. 135-217).—He was presbyter of the Church in Carthage, and a Latin writer whose logic has been called fervid and cogent. His legal mind knew nothing of the Anselmic "satisfaction" theory, yet he was the first to use that term, but he used it in reference to the acts of the repentant sinner. He does not refer it to the work of Christ. Like Justin Martyr, he plainly refutes Luther's theory (that Christ was accursed of God) built on the strength of Galatians iii. 13. He quotes Deuteronomy to show that those who hang on the tree are said to be cursed only on account of their sins. Let us look at his *Answer to the Jews* (chap. x.): "God did not maledictively adjudge Christ to this passion, but drew a distinction, that whoever, in any sin, had incurred the judgment of death and died suspended on a tree, he should be 'cursed by God,' because his own sins were the cause of his suspension on the tree."

"On the other hand, Christ, who spake not guile from His mouth, and who exhibited all righteousness and humility, not only was not

exposed to that kind of death for His own deserts, but was so exposed in order that what was predicted by the prophets as destined to come upon Him through your means, might be fulfilled."

ST CYPRIAN (A.D. 200-258).—He speaks of our Lord's redemption in the following manner (epistle lix. sc. 1): "Christ is to be contemplated in our captive brethren; and He is to be redeemed from the peril of captivity who redeemed us from the peril of death; so that He who took us out of the jaws of the devil may now Himself be rescued and redeemed (in the persons of the captive Christians) from the hands of the barbarians by a sum of money, who redeemed us by His Cross and blood."

Treatise on Public Shows, Sec. 10. "He will see that devil, who had triumphed over the whole world, lying prostrate under the feet of Christ."

Confession of Faith, Sec. 6. GREGORY THAUMATURGIS (A.D. 205-265).—He bears this testimony: "The capital element of our salvation is the incarnation of the Word."

Explication of Twelve Topics. "As sin entered into the world by flesh, and death came to reign by sin over all men, the sin in the flesh might also be condemned through the selfsame flesh in the like-

ness thereof; and that that overseer of sin, the tempter, might be overcome."

ORIGEN (A.D. 185-253).—This great and learned Father—the head of the Alexandrine school—left a permanent impression upon the Church. His writings are so voluminous, and there is so much concerning our subject, that we quote from others a summary of his teaching, and add a few quotations:

Smith's *Christian Biography*, vol. iv. p. 137.

"Origen thus insists on the efficacy of Christ's work for the consummation (*i.e.* restoration) of humanity and of the individual, as a victory over every power of evil. Though he does not attempt to explain how the sacrifice of Christ was efficacious, he frequently presents it as a ransom given to redeem man from Satan, to whom sin had made man a debtor.

Now let us turn to his own words.

Origen, *De Principalis*, book ii. chap. v.

"For they (heretics) think that it (Justice) is just to send evils upon the wicked and benefits upon the good; *i.e.*, so that according to their view, the just God does not appear to love the bad, but to be animated by a kind of hatred against them."

Book iii. chap. ii.

"Let us now look also to the New Testament, where Satan approaches

the Saviour and tempts Him; wherein also it is stated that evil spirits and unclean demons, which had taken possession of very many, were expelled by the Saviour from the bodies of the sufferers, who are said also to be made free by Him; and the Apostle Paul teaches us that we ought not to give place to the devil but 'put on,' he says, 'the armour of God, that ye may be able to resist the wiles of the devil'; pointing out that the Saints have to wrestle (Eph. vi. 13, etc.). Nay, he says that the Saviour even *was crucified by the princes of this world* who shall come to naught."

(*Contra Celsus*, i. 13): He argues that it was necessary for Jesus "to have died to ensure the destruction of a mighty evil spirit, the ruler of evil spirits who had held in subjection the spirits of all men upon the earth."

(vii. 17): "And there is nothing absurd in a man having died, and in His death being not only an example of death endured for the sake of piety, but also the first blow in the conflict which is to overthrow the power of that evil spirit, the devil, who had obtained dominion over the whole world."

Homily on the Cross and Passion, Sec. i.

METHODIUS (260-312).—He was Bishop of Tyre, and tells us: "It was for this mainly that the cross was brought in, being erected as a trophy against iniquity

and a deterrent from it, that henceforth man might be no longer subject to wrath, after that he had made up for the defeat, which, by his disobedience, he had received, and had lawfully conquered * the infernal powers, and by the gift of God had been set free from every debt.

"Since, therefore, the first-born word of God thus fortified the manhood in which He tabernacled with the armour of righteousness, He overcame, by the figure of the Cross (and as has been stated), the powers that enslaved us, and showed forth man, who had been oppressed by corruption as by a tyrant power, to be free with unfettered hands."

With this we conclude the Ante-Nicene period. The word "satisfaction" is seldom used, and then not in the Anselmic sense, but as applied to the penitent and not to Christ; and certainly the only plainly taught doctrine of the Atonement is the ransom theory, held so strongly by Irenæus and Origen.

* Evidently "through the power of God incarnate."

THE LATER FATHERS

A.D. 325-1000

As our purpose has been to present the primitive faith, we are not so much concerned with the writings of this second period; but a few quotations will help to show that the ransom theory was still generally held by the Church, and continued to be held by it until after Anselm's time.

Not one of the Fathers ever imagined, let it be distinctly understood, that the Incarnation or the Cross effected a change in the mind of God towards us, or implied a division of will between the Father and the Son. The sacrifice of Calvary, however explained, they looked upon as part of an eternal purpose, not a device to avert the wrath of the Father, but the utterance of His unfailing love.

On Nature and Grace, chap. xxiv.

St Aurelius Augustine (A.D. 354-430), the greatest of the later Fathers of the Church, bears this testimony: "His being born also was of the ability of His mercy,

not the demand of His nature; so, likewise, did He undergo death of His own power; that is our price which He paid to redeem us from death." The Pelagians denied this, and asserted that human nature needs no such ransom, in order to be translated from the power of darkness and of him who has the power of death, into the kingdom of Christ the Lord. "And yet when the Lord drew near His passion, He said, 'Behold the prince of this world cometh and shall find nothing in me,' and therefore no sin, of course, on account of which he might exercise dominion over Him, so as to destroy Him. 'But that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence' (John xiv. 31); as much as to say: 'I am going to die, not through necessity of sin (imputed to me for man's sake), but in the voluntariness of obedience.'"

St Augustine, epistle 130, xiv. 26. "Wherefore not without reason are many made righteous by the obedience of one."

Enchiridion, chap. cviii. "That the devil might be subdued by the same nature which it was his boast to have deceived."

Psalm cxxx. "The pouring forth of innocent blood blotted out all the sins of the guilty; so that a great price paid down redeemed all captives

from the hand of the enemy who captured them."

St Augustine, *De Trinitate*, xiii. 2.

"What means this, 'reconciled by the death of His Son'? Is it that when the Father was angry with us He looked on the death of His Son for us and was appeased? Had the Son, then, been so completely appeased already that He even vouchsafed to die for us: but was the Father still so incensed that He would not be appeased unless the Son died for us? And what is it that the same teacher of the Gentiles says elsewhere: 'What, then, shall we say to these things? If God be for us, who is against us? He who spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how has He not with Him given us all things?' Would the Father, unless He had been already appeased, deliver up His Son for us, not sparing Him?

"Do not these statements seem to contradict each other? In the former the Son dies for us, and the Father is reconciled to us by His death; but in the latter the Father, as though He first loved us Himself, does not spare His Son for our sakes, Himself delivers Him up to death for us. But I see that the Father loved us before also; not only before the Son died for us, but before He created the world; as the Apostle himself testifies, saying, 'As He has

chosen us in Him before the creation of the world.' Nor was the Son delivered up for us, as it were, unwillingly when the Father spared Him not; since it is said of Him also, 'Who loved me and gave Himself for me.' The Father, therefore, and the Son and the Spirit of both, work all things at the same time equally and harmoniously."

De Incarnation, Sec. 25. St Athanasius, the great doctor and polemic writer, thus asserts: "The Lord came to cast down the devil and clear the air and prepare the way for us to Heaven.

"By His death has salvation come to all and all creation been ransomed."

De Demonstratione, "Evangelica," x. 1. Eusebius, the Church historian, writes: "He took the curse upon Him, being made a curse * for us; for what else is this than a ransom for our souls?"

De Virginibus, iii. St Ambrose writes: "The adversary rated us at a low price as slaves, but the Lord ransomed us for a great price, as being made after His image and likeness."

Other writers do not hesitate to declare that Satan was deceived and outwitted.

Gregory of Nyssa declares that the In-

* The context shows Eusebius does not mean cursed of God.

carnation is a device of the wisdom of divine love, since it seemed to render accessible to the devil the essentially inaccessible to temptation.

Gregory the Great describes Christ's flesh as a bait held before the Leviathan, by the divine stratagem of the Incarnation, in order that he might try to swallow the hook of Christ's divinity, and thus come to be caught and pierced, as a fish on a hook.

It was the net to catch the bird in, according to Isidore of Seville.

Thus we are compelled to deny Dorner's statement that the satisfaction theory was "not foisted into theology by Anselm"; and we maintain exactly to the contrary.

System of Christian Doctrine, vol. iv. Sec. 115.

We agree with Uberweg, who asserts that Anselm was the first who went beyond "the theory of ransom paid the devil—a theory which, until his time, had been widely accepted, and which as held by several Fathers of the Church (Origen and other Greeks, Ambrosius, Leo the Great, and others) had extended to the avowal that God had outwitted the devil."

History of Philosophy, vol. i. Sec. 93, p. 386.

In the later times, however, there were other theories maintained besides that of the Ransom, and Christ is even called by some a sacrifice to

God; but even by them His whole life is regarded as the only limit of that sacrifice.

Some maintain (Gregory of Nyssa and Leo) that Satan came to admire Christ, and to desire Him as a victim, and thought to secure Him, and to frustrate His designs of Redemption and Reconciliation, by killing Him; but in so doing he lost all. Some repudiate any particular theory—as Gregory Nazianzus—who, in rejecting the ransom to Satan, declares that Christ's death could not have been as a ransom to God, for we were not held captive by "Him"; and next, for what reason should the blood of His only begotten Son please the Father, who would not receive Isaac when being offered up by his father, but changed the victim, and gave a ram instead of the human sacrifice?

We must maintain that the prevailing theory, in the mind and teaching of the first Millennial Church, was the ransom theory; and the general consensus is well expressed by the last author from whom we quote: Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, who lived even after the days of Anselm. He regarded the Cross as the muscipula or mouse-trap, baited with Christ's blood, by which the Evil One was caught (sent. iii. 19).

In conclusion, we quote his words: "He was made, therefore, mortal man; that by death

He might conquer the devil. For unless He were man who overcame the devil, man would seem to be violently—not justly—delivered from him to whom he had voluntarily subjected himself. But if man overcame him, he clearly lost all right over man ; and for man to conquer, God must be in him to make him free from sin. For if he were mere man or an incarnate angel, he might easily sin, as we know both natures have, by themselves, fallen. Therefore the Son of God assumed a passible * humanity, in which He tasted death for us, and by which He opened Heaven to us, and redeemed us from the service of the devil, that is from sin (for the devil's service is sin), and from punishment.

"Christ came into the strong man's house, that is into our hearts, where the devil ruled ; and so by Christ's blood, who pays (for) that He had not taken, we are redeemed from sin and thereby from the devil. For he did not hold us except by the bonds of our sins ; those were the captive's chains."

* Capable of suffering.

CONCLUDING TESTIMONY

This work—chiefly a compilation—is presented with the profound conviction that the restoration of the faith of the early Christian Fathers concerning the redemption, would be a step far in advance of the popular theology of our day.

Of the prevailing objections to the ransom theory, the principal point of contest is that it is unscriptural, especially in its antagonism to the Pauline theology. It is not within the scope of this work to refute the charge exhaustively. But in support of the ransom theory this fact is significant: the Christian Saints, Martyrs and Confessors, upon whose authority we receive certain books as inspired, and who preserved for us those books in their integrity, believed absolutely in the inspiration and infallibility of the record therein contained; and yet it seemed natural to them to accept either the ransom theory, or no theory at all; and to regard the Incarnation, Temptation, Isolation, Suffering and Death of the Son of Man—His life as a whole—to constitute the complete sacrifice to redeem us from the Prince of this World. And to whom else could God have "delivered Him up for us all"?

May not a human interpretation, grasped with blind zeal, cover and obscure the true meaning of the sacred text? For example: the Christian Fathers of a thousand years have asserted that Isaiah's prophecy ought to read, "the discipline (not chastisement) of our peace was laid upon Him"; and that St Paul (Gal. iii. 13) does not assert or mean that Christ was accursed or hated of God, but by the Jews. Yet all those who hold to the "satisfaction" theory refuse to accept the interpretation which was ably maintained, in a devotional and scholarly manner, by the pillars of the early Christian Church.

But what of Jewish sacrifices and prophecies —were they meaningless? No; but could they not well prefigure a life-long sacrifice, and tell men of their sinfulness? A Roman Catholic writer who would be expected to deny this distinctly asserts:

The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement, Oxenham. "Heathen sacrifices could scarcely, if at all, be taken as prefigurements of the death of Christ. St Augustine and others regard even the Jewish sacrificial worship more as a concession to temporary exigencies, and a safeguard against idolatry, than as having any special prophetic value."

Is Satan, then, to be regarded as another God, and are we to receive the heathen conception

of a conflict between two almost equal powers? No: but we must—to be scriptural—realize the malignity and personality of the devil, to whom our Lord conceded the right and title to the appellation: the Prince of this World.

We know of no better statement of Satan's connection with the world than that contained in the following:

Cutt's *Devotional Life of Our Lord*, page 185.

"There are many Christian people who have very vague notions about the Satan of the Scriptures. Some think him a kind of unreal personification of a principle of evil which pervades the world. Some, who believe in Satan's real personality, think of him as if he were present to every man and tempting him always; *i.e.*, as ubiquitous and omniscient; making him a kind of evil deity. It is important, for the understanding of the whole religious history and condition of man, to have an accurate knowledge of this important subject.

"Satan was originally one of the angels of Heaven; probably an archangel; one of the chiefs of the heavenly hosts. Angels, like all creatures with a free will, are liable to set their will in opposition to God's will; *i.e.*, to sin; and the Scriptures tell us that some of the angels, of whom Satan was chief, did actually sin.

"We know how fallen men and women seem

to have a jealous hatred of the good, and to take a dreadful pleasure in bringing others down to their own moral level. The fallen angels exhibit the same dreadful malice. There was, perhaps, some special relation between Satan and mankind. It has been conjectured that God executes His ordinary providential government of the universe through His angels, and that the special care of this world and its newly-created race had been committed to the archangel Satan, and that when he fell, instead of being its beneficent ruler, he became its tyrant—so far as his power permitted — in accordance with God's wonderful ways, who is accustomed to let evil kings still rule nations, and evil fathers still rule their families, but who out of all this evil eventually will deduce a higher good, and justify His long-suffering, and vindicate His wisdom and goodness.

"Others have conjectured that the fall of the angels occurred before man was created, and that the creation of this new race had some relation to the angels' fall, and that this directed the special malice of Satan against our unhappy race, and made him the special enemy of mankind. This spiritual foe of mankind, then, is a fallen archangel. By falling into sin he did not cease to be an angel and become a being of another nature. He

did not gain any new powers or any increase of his original powers ; rather, we may be sure that his original powers suffered deterioration.

"The circumstance of the baptism may have directed Satan's attention to Jesus. He, as well as the Baptist, had perhaps recognized the Messiahship: he, too, perhaps, had heard the voice saying, 'Thou art my beloved Son.' He recognizes Him of whom it had been prophesied from the beginning that 'He should bruise the serpent's head.' He recognizes the great Champion of the human race, and he, the great Enemy, enters into spiritual conflict with Him. It is an awful moment in the world's history. The Champion of the human race has entered the lists, and its great and hitherto triumphant Tyrant comes forth to meet Him, and the Deceiver is overcome."

We put forth the ransom theory, then, as more reasonable, consistent and authoritative than the satisfaction theory. That there are difficulties connected with any positive theory must be admitted. Many of the best thinkers have held that it was unwise to attempt to unravel the mystery.

The saintly Baxter, of the seventeenth century, plainly and emphatically repudiates the notions of Christ's vicarious obedience being imputed to us, and of our sins being

imputed to Him; so that He took on Himself the person of the sinner, and endured as such the wrath of God and the torments of the damned.

Butler, the author of the *Analogy*, expressly disclaims any idea of speculating on the abstract necessity of the Atonement, or of attempting to explain the manner of its efficacy. He considers that Scripture has left this matter of the satisfaction through Christ, mysterious; left somewhat in it unrevealed; and that accordingly all conjectures about it must be, if not evidently absurd, at least uncertain.

Archbishop Magee, in his valuable work on the Scriptural Doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice, while insisting on the fact of the Atonement, disclaims speculations on the reason or manner of its efficacy; viewing it as a means ordained by God, not as the cause of His forgiveness. The notion of the necessity of an infinite victim for an infinite sin, he indignantly repudiates.

Coleridge, the poet and philosopher, rejects the satisfaction theory *in toto*, but declares that the Atonement "is a spiritual and transcendent mystery that passeth all understanding," and declines to inquire into the "causative act" or "operative cause" of redemption.

The late Cardinal Newman thus preached: "Why Christ's death was requisite for our

salvation, and how it has obtained it, will ever be a mystery in this life."

That such intellectual giants refuse to formulate a theory would seem to justify this effort to effect the overthrow of that popular—yet repulsive and illogical—conception of a Father whose justice could be satisfied only by the sacrifice of His Son.

Hence the compiler presents these evidences that the Christian Church, during its first 1000 years, believed that Christ's sacrifice was life-long; and that that life can only be truly understood when every portion of it is regarded as essential to the work of redemption from the slavery that followed as a consequence of Satan's misused power; and from which man could only be redeemed by the perfect obedience —even unto death—of the Son of God.

Temptations came—mental and physical—and He—human and divine—withstood all, and is now the champion of our race, and the vanquisher of the Prince of Darkness.

Of our use of the word "redemption" let the reader look to so great an authority as Archbishop Trench. He says:

Study of Words, lecture 7, page 371.

"Lose not yourselves in vague generalities, but fasten on the central point of these—viz.: to redeem, Redeemer, redemption—that they imply a buying, and not

this merely, but 'a buying back'; and then connect with them, so explained, the whole circle of Scriptures which rest on this image; which speaks of sin as a slavery, of sinners as bondsmen to Satan; of Christ's blood as a ransom; of the Christian as one restored to his liberty."

John Stuart Blackie was a profound logician, an earnest and devout seeker after divine truth. He writes:* "When I commit a sin against a human brother, I atone for it by an apology, so far as words may suffice, and by deeds of love and kindness indicative of the reality of my profession. Or I may make a sacrifice of some good thing dear to me, and insist on my brother accepting it, if not to please him, at least for my peace of mind. This is the common-sense view of atonement for offences committed between man and man. How then with offences committed against God? Precisely the same: confess your guilt; prove the sincerity of your repentance by your deeds; and if you could give anything that might be acceptable to God by way of sacrifice, give it. But the doctrine of atonement, preached from our orthodox pulpit, is directly the reverse of all this. Here it is not the sinner who offers anything dear to him as

* By courtesy of William Blackwood & Sons, Publishers.

an atonement for his offence, but the person sinned against who is represented as giving up to death what is dearest to him to save the sinner from the natural penalty of his sin. On principles of common-sense and in accordance with the general use of language, this sort of atonement is unintelligible. It inverts the natural poles of the case, and yet has been generally accepted. How? Not, certainly, from anything which appears in the Gospels of the New Testament. Where, then, does this received doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice and substitutional atonement first appear? Without doubt in the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans, where the doctrine of the primal curse pronounced upon the human race by Adam's sin is incidentally mentioned (Romans v. 14-21); and this at once starts the important question, how far the theological opinions of that great apostle, about the work of Christ, are to be accepted by all Christians as an essential constituent of their notion of that work? I must therefore say that Paul in this matter made a mistake. I say it with sorrow, because there is no name among the leading heroes of humanity whom I revere more than St Paul,—but I say it with the most deliberate conviction, and with that spirit of peaceful resignation which the submission of the soul

to pure reason always brings along with it. There is, in fact, nothing extraordinary in the supposition that St Paul should have seen the pure ethical life and the sublime death of our Saviour through the discolouring atmosphere of Judaism in which he was bred; and it is not our merit, but our good fortune, if at this distance of time, through a less troubled medium, we can see and rejoice in the naked fact more clearly. The greatest men make sometimes the greatest mistakes: so Plato did with regard to community of wives, so Goethe with regard to the Newtonian optics,—mistakes which are easily discriminated from the great mass of sound doctrine which they preach, and removed from it without, in any appreciable degree, affecting its efficiency. That St Paul was not infallible in his religious doctrine, even the most orthodox must admit, for he believed as firmly in the speedy advent of our Lord as in His recent resurrection from the dead; and this was not only an error in respect of a metaphysico-theological dogma, like the fall of man, but he was very far from being a sound logician, and habitually mistook an allegory for an argument, as certain familiar passages in the Epistle to the Galatians and elsewhere sufficiently show. Why, then, should he not have carried his Jewish habit of mind into the

interpretation of so wonderful a fact as the life and death of Jesus Christ?—and what evil consequences to the Christian faith will follow from the general admission that he was not infallible in all points; and that men may believe in Christ as a divinely-commissioned Saviour, without being bound to every item of St Paul's interpretation of that mission. Roman history still stands, notwithstanding the disturbing scepticism of Niebuhr; Homer still sings to the world, though some Germans pull him to pieces, and others deny him altogether; and St Paul, we may depend upon it, will remain the most magnificent figure in the greatest regeneration that human society ever experienced, though not a shred of his Rabbinical logic or Judaizing theology should be allowed to stand. Neither the stream of Gospel truth as a whole, nor the authenticity of the records on which Christian faith is founded, will in the slightest degree be affected by dropping the untenable doctrine of the infallibility of the individual writers. The evidences of Christianity, internal and external, as handled by Paley, Lardner and other standard names, do not stand or fall with that doctrine; and people must make up their minds to a serious study of those precious records."

NAZARETH OR TARSUS?

Apology

So long as orthodoxy believes that its wisest course is to ignore the results of the higher criticism, he who would appeal to the occupants of the pews—nay more, desires to persuade that "man in the street" whose relation to the divine testamentary gifts is that of residuary legatee to the man in the pew—must follow the example of the pulpit, and allow himself no participation in the fruits of critical scholarship.

Nazareth or Tarsus?

I

An open volume.

Of The Man who stands before it courtesy permits the phrase "in the prime of life."

The Book, like Shakespeare, "is more praised than read"—thoughtfully.

The Man is strangely alone.

He was most unfairly handicapped in that midnight foot-race; for his competitor was encumbered with but a single garment, and that of the lightest material.

The starting-post was the bedside of an unfaithful wife.

Then he went out into the still, clear night, thanking God that the reflected shame was his alone to bear. Thankful that to no child-life would come the overshadowing ignominy of a mother's sin.

Alone; without even the memory of mother, sister, brother, child.

Not but that he had experienced a mother's love,—on its reverse side. For the women—saintly women, if you will take their funeral sermons at their face value—whom he was

obliged to call by that blessed name, had taught him that the maternal instinct in a woman is no holier, though wiser, than if it were endued with hoofs and horns to defend its own young, or to secure for its own offspring daintier pastures and sweeter waters.

There are oases in such deserts—but where the waters of Marah have fructified. Blessed are they who may abide under the beneficent shade which they foster.

This is not a story we are telling you. Come with us, as step by step we walk by the side of this man, learning his strength and weaknesses; and so, knowing his limitations, we may detect any mistake in his reasoning, any error in his conclusions.

But we cannot rightly judge whether we should allow him to influence our opinions, till we measure the sincerity of his purpose; and equally important it is to judge whether the isolating conditions of his life have made him hard and bitter or have fostered a calm, self-poised, judicial temperament.

Yet we may be sure of this: that if he is not hard and uncharitable he will possess a tenderness, morbidly sensitive through retrospect of his own suffering, which will make him vulnerable to the attacks of those who could not

victimize him through any low or selfish appeal.

Too late he had met that warning of a most accomplished student of human nature:

"Kindnesses which can be reciprocated foster friendship; kindnesses beyond the power of repayment engender hatred."

Later, when he had become as conversant with his Bible as with Tacitus, he never ceased to wonder that divine wisdom had not conveyed this warning; had left it to the heathen philosopher alone to place this beacon light, searching the soul as merely human light has seldom done. A light which—if it had lighted the Man's path in early life—would have saved him from the pitfalls that ingratitude had dug, and in which he had encountered his keenest sorrows.

II

Six months ago he stood as he stands to-day, reverently closing the volume before him.

To-day his face is firm and hard. A warrior's helmet would be a fit setting. Then it was serene and benignant; a calm restfulness possessed it.

It matters not how the impulse came: it may

have been aroused by that eloquent and persuasive preacher, Death: it may have been through retrospect of the treachery and ingratitude of whose whom he had loved and trusted; there came into his heart the longing to learn if there was a stable foundation for the hope of another existence; where to exultant, eternal youth there was presented an ever-developing knowledge: where the beautiful in myriad forms would appeal to such sublime virility that satiety would never stay the flow of endless enjoyment.

It was his good fortune to have the friendship of one of those rare characters, whose evenly-balanced intellects and generous impulses make them the confidants and helpers of any who are in doubt or trouble.

But, crossing the threshold of that friend's library, he saw that the simple breakfast was untasted and that some grave problem oppressed him.

"You are busy—hard at work—I will come again."

"No," was the answer; "stay, I need you. You of all men in the world I am most gratified to see. Here," and he almost thrust into his visitor's hand the photograph he had been studying. Then, turning to some papers, he

seemed to regard them carefully that he might in no way disturb his visitor's analysis of the "counterfeit presentment."

At length the Man laid down the picture. "Well, it ought not to be hard to trap him if he is within reach. He is vain, and that will make it easier; he is brutal, and would be merciless; it will require no fine work; it will be through his lower nature that you will trap him."

"You are right in your reading of his face," the host replied, and then he added:

"It is the old story. A foolish girl was carrying on a romantic correspondence with a supposed attaché of a foreign embassy. He had impressed on her that she must destroy his letters, and he assured her that he destroyed hers.

"She obeyed; so we have no evidence against him. Her letters were carefully preserved, and when he had secured a sufficient number he began to ask her for loans. After he had obtained all that she could give, he threw off the mask and demanded that she sell her jewellery, that she obtain money to pay her bills and send it to him, or he would use her letters to injure her.

"All of these demands were typewritten and unsigned. So they are not evidence.

"At last, every resource exhausted, con-

fronted with bills she had obtained money to pay, half sick from fear of the scoundrel, she confessed all to her parents.

"Last night they came to me. I am not on their visiting-list. I am never invited to their functions. It was just a little amusing to observe the embarrassment they laboured under as they appealed to one whom they regarded as their social inferior, for aid in a crisis that might seriously affect their daughter's social prospects. Any public prosecution they naturally dreaded. Indeed, there was no evidence to support it. They only desired to recover the compromising letters."

"There is only one way to recover those letters," said the Man.

"I know it," was the answer, and the host's face showed the keen chagrin of one who knows the methods he should employ, yet is powerless to command them.

"The Woman?" Intently the two men looked into each other's faces as the visitor asked this simple question. He, calm and impassive; the face of the other appealing mutely for help. Presently the visitor's face relaxed into a faint smile, and a slight gesture told of his ability to help.

"You have relieved me from what I was regarding as an almost hopeless position. For

the parents I cared nothing. The intense mental sufferings of the girl had enlisted my interest; yet till you offered to help me I was humiliated by my powerlessness. But tell me —this woman, do you hold her by fear or through affection?"

"Neither; through gratitude."

Then followed a short conversation that would have been unintelligible to a listener; words apparently with no relation to the subject; half sentences such as only those employ who know each other's hearts, and each so intent that words are almost needless, with each face fully in the light of the other's eyes; for each was familiar with the methods of the other in the detection of wrong-doing. So the two men arranged the details for the rescue of the girl from the power of her oppressor.

As the visitor rose to leave he said: "I value this woman's loyalty too highly to permit a needless risk. Disagreeable as is the work, I must take 'close shadow.' I would entrust no one else with her protection. Give me Hart for 'outside.'" And at whatever sacrifice on his part the loyal woman would have been protected in her perilous mission.

His hand was almost on the door when his host recalled him.

"How can I apologize for my thoughtlessness?

You have given me all that I could have asked; yet to you I have not given one thought. Tell me what service I can render to you."

"One can safely give advice to a hungry man," and the visitor laughingly called attention to the untasted breakfast; "but to ask advice from an unbreakfasted man is a temerity that I trust I have the good sense not to be guilty of."

"If you were not so modest that you are blind to the intense relief you have brought to me, you would know that my heart is so light that I could work for hours on the strength of that relief; but"—and here touched the bell—"I will order a warm breakfast for two, and while it is preparing let me share any interest or any anxiety that you entertain. Now settle yourself in this easy-chair and let me have the pleasure of making myself just a little less your debtor."

The light-heartedness and cordiality were so evident that they made it easy for the Man to reveal that longing which, next to Love, is hardest for one soul to unbosom to another.

Then the host answered: "You esteem me, I fear, more highly than I deserve when you say I am the one whose comprehensive, unbiased study has made me, in your view, the safest counsellor on a theme the importance of which I concede unreservedly. But its truths

are of such a nature that each student of them must regard their evidences largely through the media of his own temperament. So I can only offer to you that which I feel will appeal most effectively to you."

He arose, and taking from his desk a little book, he said: "Here is a gift from a dear old lady who feels that she is responsible for my spiritual welfare. To tempt me to read it she writes to me that it is the Index Expurgatorius of orthodox religious book-stores. Its brevity attracted me more. That the author is in earnest is evident. That he has struggled up—as he believes—to a light that he wishes to impart to others is equally clear. He is too reverent to destroy where he does not try to reconstruct on lines which he believes to be true and natural. I give it to you, this little *Not on Calvary*, knowing that you will weigh it carefully, confident that you will detect any false reasoning, if such it contains."

Not many days after this consultation there came to the home of the foolish virgin, a woman whose cultivation and refinement were evident. Her demand for an immediate interview she apologized for, "because moments may be precious." "Examine this package," she said. "If any letters are lacking it is best that I should

receive these again and restore them at once, that I may recover all."

Presently the girl's face told her without words, by the look of relief that suffused it, that the number was evidently complete.

"Believe me, dear child, my relief that my work is ended is little less than your joy. that you have escaped from his power."

But now the visitor saw a look of mingled contempt and fear on the mother's face. "My dear madam, I understand you perfectly, since you take no pains to conceal your thoughts. Our low estimate of others is largely a reflex of our own characters—unless we have been terribly unfortunate in our experiences. No. You have not exchanged one danger for a new one. Your secret is safe with me, for the sake of the man for whom I have made this sacrifice —greater and more repugnant than you can understand. But"—and here she held out her hand to the girl—"I believe that you trust me."

"Indeed I do, and I shall never forget your kindness. Come again and see me; I want you to be my friend."

"Thank you, dear child. And I am sure that when a true and loyal love comes to you, you will value it all the more for the counterfeit which you have received." Then, holding

her hand, she impressed the willing girl into such sincere courtesy in leave-taking that the mother was silently but emphatically rebuked.

III

Self-reliant, shrinking from taking others into his confidence—even when it was a matter of small moment—it was only a sense of duty which impelled the Man to give publicity to his new convictions.

Perhaps he was not fortunate in his choice of the clergyman through whom he desired to make a public avowal of his newly-found faith.

Simply and unreservedly as a little child, he told the story of his weariness with the humiliating and contemptible conditions of living; of his hope that there was irrefragable proof—at least presumptive evidence of the validity of the claim of the Man of Nazareth that He came with power to reveal a future life of happiness; telling, too, of his longing for fitness for such an exalted and restful existence.

Kindly, tactfully, the clergyman drew from him the history of the methods of reasoning and the influences that had led him to recognize

the truth of the beneficent mission of the Life begun in Bethlehem.

"Let me see the little book that has been the means of convincing you that there is a future worth the attaining to, and which has guided you into the knowledge of the way that leads to that life."

Prepossessed in its favour, the clergyman received the book. But his face became ominously clouded as he glanced over its pages. Slowly closing the book, he handed it back to his visitor. For a moment he sat in silence. Then, as if impelled to the performance of a painful duty, he said:

"My friend, saddest of all error is that which misleads through the glamour of sincerity. Such I believe is the *ignis fatuus* which you have followed. False light I believe it to be, although it has led you to a peaceful faith. But that faith is wrongly founded. Covertly, yet none the less intently, this little book attacks the teachings of Paul the Apostle. Reverently its author regards the mission of our Lord. But I appeal to your good sense—rather let me say to that skill in the analysis of evidence with which you are so justly credited.

"On the one hand, St Paul supernaturally converted by a revelation of the risen and reigning Christ—and divinely called to be an apostle of

Christianity, especially commissioned to preach the Gospel to the Gentile world. Under divine inspiration he wrote the epistles which bear his name. The doctrines set forth in these writings have stood the test of the most rigid investigation, and were the inspiration of those great reformations which eliminated many of the errors which had crept into the Church.

"Surely if St Paul's doctrines had been conceived in error—founded on falsities—the searching intellects of those great reformers would have discovered the fallacies of his propositions.

"Is it within the bounds of probability, I might almost say of possibility, that errors—so radical and so profound as this little book implies are incorporated by the canon of St Paul in the universal Christian faith—could have escaped the critical acumen of those intellectual giants, Calvin, Luther and the Westminster divines?

"On the other hand, we have opposed to them an obscure writer, admitting himself to be unskilled in theology, inveighing against the doctrines which have stood the test of nearly two thousand years; doctrines which have survived through all those centuries the attacks of atheists and founders of schismatic sects; yet standing to-day as firmly grounded in the

basic faith of Catholics as of Protestants; and not less of the Greek Church, of the Armenian, and of all other Christian communions.

"Let me ask you to apply to this investigation that law of probabilities on which, I presume, you have founded your success in your profession."

Then the Man replied: "I acknowledge the force of your argument; I admit the weight that is due to the consensus of belief throughout the Christian world. But you are not so wise in your personal appeal.

"So far from my successes being based on—as you say—the law of probabilities, let me remind you that most successful men do not run with the multitude in the easy grooves of probabilities. Parallel with them, perhaps; or it may be counter to them; but never adown them is a great success overtaken. But my profession has taught me to hold lightly,—that I may drop readily, if faulty,—any thread of investigation; nay, more, to be ready to couple with it, even if promising a success, any new one that possesses any appearance of leading to the truth. So I ask you to tell me where I can best learn of the teaching of Paul the Apostle. I assure you that I will enter on the study unprejudiced by that which I have previously read. In my daily life I am constantly impressed with the fact that truth is

many-sided; and its brightest facets may be unrecognized till that is cleared away which obscures them. Unreservedly I yield to your arguments; and I am allowing no protests from my 'superior ignorance'; an ignorance which, I assure you, I will overcome if you will teach me how to do so."

"Certainly—and it is always a joy to me to aid anyone who is willing to learn the true guide to such knowledge;" and as the clergyman spoke he handed to his visitor the Book, open at the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. "Were all else lost, this one letter would have given to Christianity that which has enshrined St Paul in the hearts of all believers. Then turn back to St Luke's story of his great Master's life, a life that was so full of privations; so glorified by his devotion to his mission. Then go forward and read his fervent appeals to the converts; his devoted love to his children in Christ. You cannot fail to give him your reverent admiration."

"You have described a great preacher, but you have told me nothing of his doctrines," was the calm reply. "Will you please outline them, that I may know what the Church of to-day demands as the foundation of belief?"

And the clergyman answered: "I know that your analytical mind will recognize as

irrefragable this chain of argument by which St Paul maintains his doctrines:

"First: That God created man into a state of innocence and gave him a commandment, which, if broken, brought the penalty of eternal death to him and to all his posterity.

"Second: That man broke the law,. and thus fell into a state of guilt which exposed him to the wrath of God in this life and throughout eternity. With the first man all mankind fell, and were brought under the same condemnation.

"Third: The sin being infinite, an infinite sacrifice must be offered to appease the Divine justice.

"Fourth: That this infinite sacrifice was offered in the suffering and death of Jesus Christ, who, being the second person of the Trinity, became man, and shed His blood for the sin of man; thus satisfying the claims of Justice.

"Yet, better than answer of mine are the words of the blind Milton, who was compensated for his loss of vision by a clearer spiritual insight:

"'*Man, losing all,*
To expiate his treason hath naught left,
But to destruction sacred and devote
He with his whole posterity must die:

Die he or justice must; unless for him
Some other able, and as willing, pay
The rigid satisfaction: death for death.'

And their inspiration was in Paul's fearless, unqualified insistence on the doctrine of atonement through the blood of Christ. Read his epistles and you will learn the truth of the mission of the Christ."

The inquirer listened respectfully, yet resolved to find and to follow the truth; whether it led him with the multitude or alone into the wilderness.

Perhaps there was a degree of chagrin at his discomfiture, in the impulse that led him—before he entered on these studies—to read again the little book; but this time side by side with the words of those who had been chosen by the Life to be the historians of His acts, the recorders of His utterances.

"Reverently its author regards the mission of our Lord"—he remembered that the clergyman had said of the little book. And as he compared the book with their teachings, he found no injustice had been done by its author to the evangelistic writers.

And now there came before him a condition, which in a mind less self-reliant and analytical would have produced one of two results.

Possibly a yielding of his judgment to the asserted authority of the Church; but far more likely to have sent him to join that great body of semi-unbelievers who put aside the consideration of divine truth, because they claim that they cannot understand its complexity; the fault theirs equally with those public teachers who have placed before them the temptation to thus avoid their duty.

Let us then consider the condition which confronted him. There seemed to be a choice between two conclusions only. First, that the Life had purposely omitted to convey a system of theology to those whom he had chosen as His historians; and that later He had revealed this system to Paul the Apostle, and through him to the world. Or, secondly, that the Life did not comprehend its mission, and so did not recognize while on earth the need of revealing to mankind that system of theology and that theory of his office—a knowledge of which was essential to an availing of the benefits of His life and death—and so a later revelation was needed, and this knowledge was conveyed through Paul. Then—in either case—the little book was grossly in error, or worse, in suppressing these important truths of later revelation. That there might be another proposition—that neither of these

was true—did not occur to him, so perfect was his confidence in his teacher.

Desiring to devote all of his attention to the study of the evidence presented to him, there were appeals made to him which he could not resist; there came demands on his time which engrossed him in behalf of others. But one evening, too weary for study, he had taken up the Gospel of St John to beguile the hour with the beauty of its presentation of the love of our Lord. He read on uncritically till he came to the words: "But now ye seek to kill me. . . . Ye do the will of your father. . . . Ye are of the father, the devil . . . he was a murderer from the beginning."

Carefully he re-read these sentences, studiously he examined the intervening words to see if he had done violence to the meaning of these sentences by grouping them together; critically he examined the context to find if it modified the apparent continuity of thought. Assured that the grouping did no violence to the meaning of the words, he closed the book. For a long time he sat overcome by the thoughts that crowded. Fatigue was forgotten now in the absorbing consideration of the vista that these words opened. By the side of them he placed the words of the clergyman: "Without shedding of blood there is no

remission of sins." A less robust intellect would have been appalled at the complexity of thought which this juxtaposition engendered, as he questioned with himself as to what were the relations to one another of these transcendent personalities which were to be participants in this impending shedding of blood.

Were the two divine personalities unable to effect the atoning sacrifice without the co-operation of that fallen angel whom they had deposed from heaven? Or had he intruded his participancy, and the Divine were unable to repel him? And why did he take a part in this shedding of blood if that sacrifice was to be the means by which the Christ would overcome him? Why should he be so earnest in his purpose to effect the undoing of his own undoing of the race? Surely not through ignorance, for in the desert and on the pinnacle of the temple he had recognized and battled with the Divine.

The midnight hour bade the Man to rest. But for days thereafter these questions were the undercurrent of his thoughts.

And then there came into his heart the longing for peace. Why not seek it in the Roman communion? It forbade such vain searching after truth; it asserted its possession of authoritative revelation of truth. To those

who succeeded him there had been handed down by him to whom the Christ had delivered the keys of his Church, the power to distinguish truth from error. So it claimed: and why not seek the peace it offered through this claim? But the proof? What is the evidence that the Christ did not complete the Messianic message, but had left important truths for those later revelations on which the Roman Church founded so much of its claims to unquestioning credence? Why, Paul! Yes, Paul. He must be the corner-stone of that Church's claims, for to him —first of all—there came the vision of heaven and the bestowal of revelations that the Lord could not or would not communicate to His chosen twelve: revelations on which are founded the basic doctrines of the Christian Church in its entirety—so the clergyman had told him.

In unmistakable terms the Lord had thus proclaimed through Paul the incompleteness of his teachings on earth. So the Roman Church was logical in its claim that all down the ages it had received fresh revelations of the Divine will. Then he recalled that twice within his century the Roman Church had received such evidences of the Divine favour; revelations that were the complement, the natural sequence, of those of which Paul had, at the outset, been

the medium. Yes, there is rest, if the evidences of revelations are unassailable; and if they are assailable, the corner-stone, Paul, must first be found to be unsound. Yet this power which the Church claimed—what if that should fall into over-zealous or even unscrupulous hands?

Vainly and long he sought the test for this. Yet the more intently he pursued it the more it eluded him. He was convinced that his reason could not comprehend the methods of this test. There seemed no alternative but to subscribe to belief in that which was beyond his comprehension; and the maze became more bewildering at each step. Grimly there came to his mind the Hibernian definition of faith: "The gift of God which enables you to believe what you know isn't true." But at last he rose and took a volume * from his shelves and read:

"'Yes,' said the tall and solemn elder, 'it is indeed nothing less than a revelation received by the head of the Church last night. It concerns both you and your daughter.'

"'My daughter,' gasped the woman, in scarcely audible tones, and I saw one hand grasp the back of a chair convulsively.

"'Your daughter, who has now grown to

* Mrs J. K. Hudson, in *The New Lippincott.*

womanhood,' continued the elder, 'and owes her allegiance to the Church.'

"'What is the revelation?' the woman forced her drawn lips to ask.

"'Through the grace of the all-wise Father it has been revealed to his disciple, Brigham Young, that your daughter Clarissa should become the third wife of Elder W——, here present with us.'

"An awful silence ensued, and then a convulsive movement in the woman's throat, as if her voice refused to utter a sound, attracted the attention of all, and the men bowed their heads that they might not see."

The Man gave a sigh of relief. "That danger is past. If brutal lust can successfully simulate divine revelation; can invoke its semblance to sanction its outraging of all that is pure in womanhood; then I demand of the faith that I acknowledge that it be untainted by the slightest suspicion that any revelation to which it lays claim is soiled by sordid motive. It must give me indubitable evidence that he, through whom the revelation came, was a prophet of pure vision, of clear and judicial intellect which did not refract truth through vanity or prejudice.

"Now to the study of Paul. I have faith in

my teacher. Yet with an earnestness that I never employed before I will analyze the evidence of Paul's fitness to be the prophet who revealed our Lord's true mission to mankind."

Never before had he attempted to solve a problem that had so perplexed him—because never before had he been shut in between two opposing truths. Truths they must be; for God's minister had endorsed "essential to salvation" across the dicta of Paul, while to the beloved disciple was attributed the seemingly conflicting words of his Master.

"Could it be," he asked himself, "that there is demanded an insight superior to mere mental vision, to reconcile these? For surely no human intellect can bring order out of the chaos that these create. Perhaps, after all, the Catholic devotee is right when he surrenders individual judgment and admits the claims of his Church that it possesses a divinely-endowed power to recognize truth: a power mysterious and incomprehensible except to those through whom God has made His revelation."

But these were only passing thoughts. The Man's intellect was too virile—perhaps intellectual pride may have been a potent influence—to permit him to accept any solution to which his judgment did not assent. Yet, turn which way he would, like the angel with the flaming

sword, this question barred the way: "If the Divine sacrifice was essential to the salvation of the race, why was the devil impelling his 'children' to affect the atoning death?" and "Was it from choice or necessity that God admitted the devil as co-worker in the plan of salvation?" And—though less important than the first—there came another question: "Why did the Lord denounce those who were necessary instruments in carrying out the Divine plan of salvation?" Yet till the Man had read all that his teacher had indicated to him he would suspend judgment.

IV

"I THANK you for the lesson you have given me to-day."

The speaker was a splendid specimen of manhood. The Man admired handsome animals; and it was the torso and limbs of an athlete that commanded favourable regard when the vacant place in his employ was applied for. He had accepted the applicant, partly because there was a "black mark" opposite his name, for the Man knew that in this lay the possibilities of developing a *fides Achates.*

And the lesson.

Ten miles behind them they had left the county jail, and now they are nearing the home of the Man. Almost silently they had watched the noble bay as he swayed from side to side, breasting the storm and breaking his way through the fast-gathering snow, never slackening his gait, though from time to time an ear was turned backward in that silent appeal for encouragement which only an intelligent horse will make, and which only a true lover of horses can interpret.

As they had entered the heavy doors of the prison it was evident that the Man was not a stranger there, and that he was regarded with respect.

"Let me see the prisoner who was committed on the 7th. I would like to talk with him, with your permission." This to the official who had received him with such marked deference.

With an expression half-cowed, half-brazen, and wholly suspicious, the prisoner shambled through the door which opened from a double tier of cells.

His visitor met him more than half-way, then led him to a chair and sat by his side. "Thank you for coming out to meet me." The

voice had a cheery, distrust-dispelling ring. "Now, we are going to be good friends; and I will help you if you will let me."

As he spoke he dropped from his own knee to that of the prisoner a slab of tobacco. Lying there, it served as a drawbridge on which a new-born confidence was timidly venturing to meet the visitor.

Presently the prisoner placed the gift in his pocket; but the expression of his face showed that he was apprehensive lest it might possess some of the qualities of the Trojan horse: that it might include some secret power that could open the gates of his soul to a watchful enemy.

"Your old pal said it was just your size."

The prisoner's face lighted up as his visitor named the associate. But this "slang" name, as well as the thieves' vernacular in which the prisoner spoke—and which his visitor used so far as was needed to establish confidence—it would be an affectation to repeat here.

"But I thought that he was keeping shady."

"So he is; but you know that we must trust someone; and by the way, the —— gang are boasting that they have put you out of harm's way for at least ten years."

Then there burst from the lips of the inmate an exuberant efflorescence of profanity which

evidently had its roots in his soul, and these were fructified by the intensest hate.

With seeming carelessness the visitor had made the remark; yet he knew that the success or the failure of his important mission depended upon how the apparently indifferent remark was received. The prisoner was too much absorbed in his "cursory remarks" to observe the deep breath of relief and the faint smile that assured success had elicited.

"Now, my dear fellow," and the visitor laid his hand on the inmate's shoulder—rising as he spoke—"my friend here is all right, but you and I can chat more freely at the foot of the corridor. Come;" and together they went to the end of the long passage. As they stand there silhouetted against the clear light let us regard them for a moment. One, erect, with a military bearing that made soldiers instinctively salute as they passed him. The other, cringing yet reckless; manhood gone, but defiant, as if Fate had done its worst.

Presently the Man extends his hand. The prisoner's is half outstretched to meet it, only to be withdrawn in the vacillation of a spirit which has learned the lesson of distrust through falseness to itself. But in another moment, as he reads truth and honour in the face of the Man, the reluctant hand is impelled, as if by an

impulse of distrust of his own distrust. So the weak thief and the strong man pledged faith to each other.

A short conversation follows, the visitor making a few notes in his tablets, showing them to the prisoner lest he might fear that confidence had been strained.

When the prisoner and his visitor have returned to the main corridor of the jail and have joined the Man's attendant, the Man said:

"We owe my friend here something for leaving him alone. Come, now, tell him some of your experiences."

"Experiences—nothing," and the prisoner turned away half sullenly, leaning his head on his hands.

"Doesn't it pay?" The words came slowly and with a shade of taunt in the tone. The Man was intent on drawing him out. The lesson must be taught.

"Pay? Pay? Pay hell! Say, do you believe in a devil? I do!" And the prisoner sat erect and faced his hearers, his manner almost defiant. "He draws us on; he stirs up all the recklessness and false pride in us. And then, when he has ruined and betrayed us, he laughs at us. I mean it. I have seen him come into my cell and gloat over me; and

when I struck at him my fist went through him into empty air."

It was a theory of the Man that no healthy mind consents to crime.

"And back again to prison we go after a few weeks—at most a few months—of freedom.

"But what is there for us but crime when we get out? We know that we have the prison pallor; we fear we have the lock-step to further betray us as criminals. If kind hearts secure work for us our past must be told. We may begin well; but we get tired of being regarded with pity at the best; perhaps with contempt. The reckless devil in us is waked up, perhaps by reading of a successful crime—successful till the sleepless vigilance of the police run it down.

"Then we are at it again; and in we go again. That settles it; we are 'professionals' then, and we have no place to go when our time is up but into the haunts of thieves. We have longed for time-up, and we mean to be more cautious. Society, we feel, is our enemy, and we will make it 'life against life' if we get in a tight place. But we don't. We get caught again, and we curl up like whipped dogs—if the odds are not in our favour.

"Maybe it's the women who pull us down. They are kind to us when we come out. Maybe

it isn't all selfishness on their part. We are men, and they are all the women we have; and when they welcome us and expect nothing from us—for a time at least—we lay our heads in their laps like Samson, and we listen to their stories of how different gangs have made big hauls and how generous they were to their women. And as the days go by, and we are idle, they rally us on our lost nerve.

"Then our false pride is aroused, and we go out to win—perhaps. And if we win we are proud of it; and we boast of our success to them—in acts, maybe, more than words; and they betray us. Not intentionally; they have a woman's love of gossip; they love, like other women, to show their knowledge of what is going on in their world; and how can they be truer to us than they are to themselves? And soon the gossip filters down to where the police have their lines out to catch any bits of information. And we are run in.

"Do you think that we confess to the police? Not much! Our lawyers have taught us to keep our mouths closed—if no one else has—and we have learned by experience that the police cannot get us shorter terms if we confess. But they have the game in their own hands. There is no one to dispute them; but usually they are right. We travel beaten paths, and it

is easy to follow our path once they are on it, and that path usually leads through a gambling house. The 'confession' shields someone who has peached on us—and jurymen read the newspapers.

"But I could tell you stories of the devotion of the wives of thieves; how they grow gray and worn supporting themselves and trying to lay by something till their men are free: how their women's eyes see through the weakness or the treacherous nature of the men their husbands intend to make their pals; how their women's love sharpens their wits to find the safest ways to work or to elude the police. Often they could save their men from detection if the husbands would only be guided by their wives."

He stopped awhile, then cynically added:

"Yes. If a few days of wild pleasure is enough for years inside of prison walls then it pays."

"There is a storm gathering, and we have a long ride before us; else we would stay and chat longer with you."

The lesson had been taught and the Man was ready to go. "And now a word of advice. Listen attentively to the chaplain. If he observes you and seeks you out personally do me

the favour to show him that you value his counsels. I am not advising you to play the hypocrite. You can be sincere if you choose, and I hope you will be."

"I will promise to do the best I can to follow your advice," was the reply.

Needlessly long the prisoner held his visitor's hand as he bade him good-bye. It was more than parting with the man who was the first in many years whom he had trusted. He felt that he was parting from honesty and honour.

As the visitor passed out he asked for and received the address of the chaplain.

The office of public prosecutor is one in which many a travesty or miscarriage of justice is effected. That is inevitable where the "one-man power" has no check. In a wiser jurisprudence this needless temptation as well as danger will be guarded against. But, on the other hand, there can be such discriminative skill in using leniency as a means to acquire important evidence, that the arbitrary power of that office may make it a safe repository of information; so that the otherwise impracticable methods of justice will be made effective.

To such a wisely-administered office there came the knowledge of what the prisoner had done to prevent a great crime.

So when the kind chaplain bore witness to the prisoner's penitence, the public prosecutor had pretext for asking that the greatest possible leniency be shown to the penitent.

And when the judge gave only a light sentence, the good chaplain came forward and grasped the prisoner's hand, certain that it was through his ministrations—and these alone—that the mitigation was established.

But the prisoner looked, through eyes dimmed by gratitude, beyond the clergyman wondering at the strange indifference, to the Man whom he knew had kept his word, and had unobtrusively wrought the mitigation of his sentence.

Then he, for whose sake the lesson had been elicited, resumed:

"I am not afraid to tell you that more than you know—more, perhaps, than I know—I have taken your lesson to heart.

"When I applied to you for employment I came believing what your enemies had said of you; and I came prepared to throw that in your face, if you had refused me because you had heard bad reports of me. I saw that you looked me through and through; and I felt that you cared only for what your eyes told you. They who hated you, because they had

found out that you had a heavy hand for those who were cruel or unjust, had taught me that your home was a fit place for a man who has made such a slip as I have made."

"I saw all of that plainly," was the answer, "and I saw that beneath it were the possibilities of a faithful member of my household."

"By degrees I saw that your enemies had lied about you. Then surprise changed to admiration; and before I knew it I was growing to love your home.

"There is not there one of the things I had been taught a home needs. Not one person in it who has not the right to leave at any moment. Not one tie to fix anyone there. Yet each one is thoughtful of the comfort of the others. Never an impatient word or a word of command; and there is no fear there, except the fear of failing to please you.

"When I was a boy I used to visit my grandfather. Each morning I had to listen to his long reading and his longer prayers; but I was comforted by thinking about the waffles and maple syrup that would follow. I remember that one morning he read how the Hebrew servant, when his time was up—I mean when his freedom came, but loving his master so well that he did not wish to leave him—would let his master run an awl through his ear and

fasten him to a door-post of the house; and then he was a part of the household as long as he lived. If it was the custom now I would furnish the ear if you would furnish the awl and the door-post."

Then, more seriously, he added:

"I never before knew what the word home meant. I can't expect you to trust me so soon; but I shall be glad when you can tell me you have confidence in me and will let me feel that it is my home. I will work hard for this."

In the Man's voice and manner there was more of the comrade than of the master, as he gave assurance of how deeply the expression of devotion had moved him, as he replied:

"And now you are part of our home. Its honour is yours to protect; and more, it will protect you. Whoever, from this time forward, reflects on you attacks our home. You are not built in such a way that you need to take a gross insult from any man. But you will have the good sense not to proceed to extremities."

"You need not fear—if the insult is to me alone. If it is to you or to our home, there is likely to be an accident which will need hospital treatment."

"Well, here we are; home at last. I will send out a cup of hot milk to you; for I know that you will not leave Don while there is a moist hair on him."

"Trust me for that; every hair will be 'as dry as a drunkard's morning throat' before I close the stable door."

"Unto whom much is forgiven, the same loveth much,"—and long and faithfully—if the hand of him who forgives has iron under the velvet.

Some weeks later the press was loud in the praises of the alertness of the police of a small city, because it had thwarted the attack on the home of a bank cashier, whom it was intended to force into revealing the combination of the safe of his bank.

Yet apparently the condition could not have been more favourable for successful entering. The policeman on that beat was evidently asleep. The window of the house yielded to the jemmy without a sound; the operator had no difficulty in unfastening the street door that his fellows might enter. But immediately the hall where he stood was flooded with light, and at the head of the stairway he saw the form of the cashier crouching motionless in the shadow.

Lightly bounding up the stairs, the burglar drew his revolver and covered the unmoved form, which maintained that serenity which one has a right to expect from a lay figure which has never done anything to shatter its nerves.

The "drowsy" policeman's Winchester glittered chillily as the burglar turned at the "hands up!" which came from the doorway which he had left open for his pals. But they were detained outside. For two noisy roysterers who would not "go home till morning," and had to cling to each other for mutual support, had suddenly been sobered and passed noiselessly up to the pals and gave each a wrenching grip on arm and shoulder which made each stand quietly, bending over with pain, in an attitude as if looking for lost valuables; while a most disreputable-looking tramp crawled out from under the veranda where he had been asleep, growling because he had been awakened from his nap; but when requested to assist in securing the burglars he applied the bracelets with a deftness and celerity which was remarkable in a novice.

Behind the foliage on the other side of the street crouched a woman. Her rigid face and staring eyes were like those of the dead as she watched the silent procession. For there was

one man there to whose aid she would have gone had he been wounded; though the devotion would have cost her commitment.

She had been a most faithful servant—"such a treasure!—so superior to her class!"

In a safer hiding-place than her trunk she had carried away drawings of the interior; while her faithful heart had carried all of the details of the complete "piping off" of the house of the cashier.

And now the faint tinkle of the steel links seemed like a far-off knell; for dead to her for ten long years at least would be the man she loved.

V

Most cordial was the clergyman's welcome. All his experience assured him that the coming again of the truth-seeker could have but one motive—the admission of the truth of the accepted Christian theology.

But in the full light of his study, as the two men faced each other, there was an ominous hardness in the visitor's face.

"With sorrow I observe that you are not at peace."

And the Man answered: "And why peace?

Did not He say: 'I come not to bring peace, but a sword'? Over your door I saw no warning legend: 'Who enters here leaves peace behind'; but here I left the peace that was like a child's trust, and I have not regained it, nor have I found its semblance in the line of study that you marked out for me, though I have faithfully followed it."

The clergyman recognized the challenge and mentally girded himself for the struggle.

"I have studied that man, Saul of Tarsus, as I have never searched the life of any other man. It is a most absorbing subject."

"And you find that he is—"

"The most complex character that I have investigated. Unreservedly I concede him to be, *facile princeps*, the Christian poet of the first century. Poet surely, and with all of the 'divine madness' of the poet. The 'divine' in a poetical sense. The 'madness' we will consider in this analysis." As he said this he laid a roll of manuscript on the study table.

"Yet I beg that you will recognize that in this attempt to prove that Paul's mind was disordered, and also in that which I shall say to you here to the same effect, my only sentiment is pity for his sufferings—which are so apparent. Wherever I express contempt or indignation, it is directed only nominally against

him. My contempt is for those who have refused to recognize Paul's incapacity to develop a system of Christian theology; who have accepted his vagaries as divine truth, and have demanded their general acceptance. It is against these alone that I make my complaint. For I recognize in him an earnest seeker after righteousness. Nay, more; he highly attained to righteousness; for his innate revulsion to that which was unrighteous was an integral part of his nature. Yet he seems to me to have been saturated with an intense egotism that gave its colour to his beliefs and utterances."

"But surely if you concede his innate love of righteousness you cannot but admit his fitness to be a teacher of divine truth?"

"A teacher — no. A preacher—a most eloquent preacher—yes. There is a vast difference between the two. But the innate desire for righteousness does not include all that is essential to the leading of men into a true faith. Teachers most unlike him have been possessed by this desire. 'Would you know,' says Epictetus, 'the means to perfection which Socrates followed? They were these: In every single matter which came before him he made the rule of reason and conscience his one rule to follow.' So, too, with Mohammed.

The unity, spirituality, presence and power of God, the necessity of righteousness, were truths clear to him."

"But surely you would not compare Mohammed with Paul?"

"Compare them? Certainly. Attempt to draw a parallel?—surely not. That would be manifestly unfair—to Mohammed. He fell before the temptations which he, evidently standing alone, encountered in his short life. Nay, more; he encountered those temptations in almost as few years as through centuries the Church—in its entirety, with its strength of numbers and organization—battled; and it, too, fell. And both fell before the same temptations. His purity of purpose—whether you call it divinely implanted or only a natural revulsion to the evil about him—fell; just as the Church at that time had fallen before the temptations of self-gratification and love of power. And the last of these was doubtless, in both instances, the parent of the other. If Mohammed's self-indulgence was animal it was not less debasing than was that form which possessed the Church. "Faith had evaporated in worship of images; still more in discussion of metaphysical subtleties about God; had given way to a worldliness and corruption that could not be hidden." And the intellectual pride which had substituted

these metaphysical subtleties for the pure faith bequeathed to the simple Galilean fisherman, was plainly traceable to the malign influence which clearly had its impulse, at least its excuse, in the scholastic vanity of Saul of Tarsus, who held in such unmistakable contempt the message given to those humble attendants whom our Lord had chosen as His apostles.

"Could there have percolated down to Mohammed—rather let us say, if his then pure spirit had possessed the opportunity to draw up to it—a genuine Christianity; if, too, the power of evil had not taken away Khadijeh, his true wife, his consoler in his spiritual despair, his guardian against temptation—who can forecast the power for good that Mohammed would have wrought in rebuking the debased Christianity of his day, in 'provoking' it to resume its apostolic purity?"

"Do you consider Mohammed equally inspired with Paul?" the clergyman asked.

"Why not? Paul was always a Pharisee; with all of the bad and all of the good qualities of the Pharisee. He never abandoned that attitude. Mohammed heard his call while engaged in earnest, humble searching after God, and he eagerly followed what he believed to be the voice of Gabriel. Saul of Tarsus

was terrorized out of an antagonism to the Christ whom he was persecuting. Far more wonderful miracles than the light that shone at noonday and the voice that spoke to him on the way to Damascus had attested the divinity of the Christ. To these greater miracles he was indifferent, though doubtless he knew of them. Personal fear, the blinded eyes; these overpowered him. Yet they had sufficiently their *raison d'être* in the deliverance of the Damascus believers from his persecutions. There was no precedent in the acts of our Lord for such methods of choosing and dedicating an apostle."

"Then you believe that Mohammedanism had possibilities that could have developed it into being the peer of Christianity in true spirituality?" the clergyman asked.

"Surely not; for it did not possess the elements of intellectual strength with which a pure spirituality must be allied; for there were inherent weaknesses which made impossible even the maintaining of the wonderful triumphs of the Moslems in the Middle Ages. But its fatal weakness is that in it there is no place for the Divine love. It taught only God's sovereignty.

"In missing the love of God it failed to attain to that which is the only foundation of

pure altruism, on which alone must rest a true spirituality—as well as a progressive civilization —and no other can be abiding.

"And yet how beautiful was the calling of Mohammed. 'Thou art the messenger of God, and I am Gabriel.' Such was the message which he believed had come to him.

"Disappointments, mockery, insults, persecutions were given to him in as full measure as to Paul; but unflinchingly he bore them; and his faith failed not.

"We admire Paul's attacking the worship of Diana in Ephesus. Mohammed's motive and experiences in Mecca were almost parallel.

"The appeal of his hunted followers is as beautiful as if from the lips of Christian devotees: 'Oh, King, we lived in ignorance, idolatry and unchastity; the strong oppressed the weak; we spoke untruth; we violated the laws of hospitality. Then a prophet arose, one whom we knew from our youth; with whose conduct and good faith and morality we were well acquainted. He taught us to worship one God, to speak truth, to keep good faith, to assist our relations, to fulfil the rites of hospitality, and to abstain from all things impure, ungodly, unrighteous. We believed him, and followed him.

"'But our countrymen persecuted and tortured us, and tried to cause us to forsake our religion. And now we throw ourselves upon thy protection. Wilt not thou protect us?' Then one of them recited a part of the Koran that spoke of Christ; and the king and the Christian bishops wept upon their beards. And the king dismissed the Ambassador of the Koreysh, and would not give up the refugees. Thereupon persecution waxed hotter in Mecca; and Mohammed answered it with: 'While God commands me, I will not renounce my purpose.'"

"But you admit that Paul was possessed by a real love of righteousness. The fruit of that must be a noble exemplification of the moral law; and if he was filled with revulsion to the law, because it had failed to establish the moral precepts, then the general influence of his teachings must be to establish moral conditions—even if sometimes he is led away, by his intensity, into hyperbole and poetical exaggeration."

To this the Man replied: "Any really great leader must be the master of himself; and nothing could be more confusing, in our attempts to establish the moral responsibility of each individual, than is Paul's statement that he was possessed by an influence, inde-

pendent of himself, that impelled him to do wrong contrary to his intent.*

"Hence if we were to allow, generally, this shifting of moral responsibility—through the attributing the culpability for sin to an external power, either personal or impersonal; which was not simply an influence, but an irresistibly impelling power — we should lower moral standards, through weakening of individual responsibility.

"Thus Paul's influence did not make for moral conditions, as his own admissions so painfully conceded. Paul's influence was certainly bad in this respect. I do not forget that elsewhere—indeed almost immediately—Paul takes an entirely contradictory attitude; but this is another instance of that vacillation which adds to our confusion; and adds to our distrust of the man, of his doctrines, and of the validity of his claims to inspiration. Paul may have caused—surely furnished the palliation of —the Manichæan tenet of inherent evil in the flesh. In our estimate of what constitutes moral responsibility nothing could be more confusing than are these statements of Paul.

* Rom. vii. 1: "So it is no more I that do it (evil), but sin that dwelleth in me." Rom. vii. 25: "So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin."

"Plato was not only nearer right, but he was clearer and more convincing in his strong, incisive reasoning—so sharply contrasting with Paul's vacillation, and with his impulsive, emotional utterances. 'God is not the author of evil. Moral evil is the result of the abuse of free agency, and God stands justified in creating beings liable to both;' *i.e.*, liable to exposure to good and evil."

"Then you do not believe in an actual personal devil?" the clergyman asked.

"Most assuredly I do. Else I could not justify my belief in the Gospel according to St John.

"Through a form of what might be called Spiritualism I have been forced to one of two conclusions. First, that I—in common with every friend who has co-operated with me in my investigations—am possessed of an eidolon, or dæmon, its existence wholly unsuspected till sought and questioned; which is coarse, lying, profane, fond of giving pain through false statements; moreover, it can use our muscles as it wills, and this control is without the consciousness of that part of our intelligence which we call our minds. Or else I must believe that there are actually lost spirits which come and tell of their intimacy with and submission to the devil. I was obliged to end my investigations

because they were evidently so unwelcome that they provoked only profane and abusive manifestations. Of this alone I am sure: that spiritualism is simply a revelation of that which is wholly bad within us or of a malign power which is external to us; and surely I wish to believe that there is a devil and his angels, rather than to think that the coarseness, maliciousness and profanity which were almost invariably expressed, were not the outward and visible sign of a debased inward spirit, which was an inherent part of the mind and soul of my friends and of myself. I regret that I could not investigate further; still I can conceive of no scientific test that could have been applied to demonstrate either theory. Yet I shall never forget the expressions of self-contempt for life misspent on earth, whatever their source may have been. Hence I do not challenge Paul's statement that he was attacked by a power wholly external to himself.

"But it is incredible that this malign power could enter and dominate a soul which, as Paul claims, had been consecrated by a divine call to apostleship and by a special revelation of the Christ will and teachings, and yet these divinely-endowed influences be so powerless to resist the demon that they succumbed and

left Paul a prisoner in the hands of the power of evil.

"One or the other of these statements is untrue; yet presenting an incongruity that is thoroughly Pauline. I do not forget Judas; but he voluntarily entertained the tempter.

"But to return to Paul. Thoroughly arbitrary are his assumptions in regard to the relations of free will to God. Is what men do the result of their own choice or is it determined for them, and if the latter, how can they justly be punished? The answer is given in the form of an antinomy, of which the thesis is the sovereignty of God and the antithesis the responsibility of men. He states that the sovereignty of God is absolute; that God has no moral obligation to men; there is no qualification of God's power. He quotes the law and the prophets to show that only a remnant, an elect remnant, of Israel would be saved; and that all others should be blinded. But when he finds himself involved by the statement that God has blinded and reprobated other men so that they shall not reach this blessing, Paul can escape only by the arbitrary and literal use of the poetical imagery of Jeremiah and of the son of Sirach: the figure of the clay and the potter. 'He hath mercy on whom

Rom. iii. 5; ix. 19.

he will, and whom he will he hardeneth.' Rom. ix. 18-23. The 'vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction'; 'vessels of mercy prepared unto glory.' Yet elsewhere Paul attempts to vindicate God by attributing to man an entire responsibility for his acts, but makes no attempt to reconcile the conflicting theories. He further defines God's plan of bringing the knowledge of salvation to the Gentiles as including the purpose thus to 'provoke to jealousy' the Jews, and that the Gentiles 'now have obtained mercy' by the disobedience of the Jews; 'even so have these also now been disobedient, that by the mercy shown to you they also may now obtain mercy.' The crowning absurdity of these utterances is: 'For Rom. x. 32. God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all.' Not only is this illogical, but it is in direct contradiction to Paul's statement that only 'an elect remnant of Israel should be saved.' And then, in one of those periods of lucidity that only emphasize his aberration, in the next two verses, Paul says: 'How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out. For who hath known the mind of the Lord?' This calm, consistent flow of thought and language is as if another writer had taken up the pen of Paul to rebuke

him for that looseness and extravagance of expression, for that claim to knowledge of the divine intent, which would be blasphemy from one who was sane.

"Most repugnant—and in no way authorized by the words of our Lord—are Paul's statements
Gal. iii. 13. that Christ was 'made a curse for
2 Cor. v. 21. us'; and 'He made him to be sin for us.' Wholly different, too, from the belief of the early Fathers, who specifically rejected this.

"His theology is so different from that of St John. 'He was manifested to take
1 John iii. 5-8. away our sin.' 'For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.' In this epistle, as in the Fourth Gospel, we see the rejection of Christ explained, not as a casual outcome of individual caprice or wickedness, but as an inevitable result of the eternal antagonism between light and darkness.

"Paul further adds to his confusion of doctrine by: 'But if our Gospel is veiled . . . the god of this world hath blinded the minds
2 Cor. iv. 4. of unbelievers.' Yet he has repeatedly stated that God is the cause of this blindness.

1 Cor. xv. 29. He does not rebuke, but records with seeming approval the baptizing of the

living for the dead. How can we condemn the doctrine of purgatory and the saying of masses for the dead so long as we make no protest against these words of Paul?

"Here, as frequently elsewhere, he furnishes
1 Cor. xx. 24-28. to modern Unitarianism and to the heretical sects of the early Church, their authority for believing in the inferiority of the Son to the Father.

Eph. i. 20. "He clearly implies that the power which Christ subsequently held was not previously existent, as power co-equal with that of the Father, but a lesser power, and that it was not bestowed in its fullness till after the ascent to heaven.

"What matters it that these assumed limitations of our Lord are directly opposed to His positive and repeated claims to co-equal and co-existent power. Theology demands that
John x. 18. the dicta of Paul be unquestioned, even if they are contrary to the unqualified statements of our Lord.

1 Cor. viii. 6. "'The Father of whom are all things and Jesus Christ through whom are all things,' is like the Logos of Plato. That Paul does not refer to the Johannean Logos was perhaps because he was imbued with the theory of Philo: for Paul refers to
Col. iii. 16. the spirit of Christ, in terms so like

the conceptions of Philo and so unlike the Johannean conception, that the omission suggests the question whether his antagonism to the apostles made him ready to accept, or was caused by his Platonic views on this important doctrine."

VI

In support of his criticism the Man quoted:

"Who can measure the evil that came from Paul's practical denial of the true Logos? That he still held to his Jewish theological ideas is shown by his urging the universality of death as proof of universality of sin, 'for it was a fixed Jewish belief that God created all men to be immortal.' Yet that all men died, Paul claimed was evidence that all men had sinned. But he gives no explanation of how he deduces this, or how revealed to him. He states that sin is universal, and that it is so inevitably. He attempts to prove this by stating that sin is inseparable from human nature, but gives no evidence to support the statement that mankind as a race was involved in the sin of Adam. Rom. v. 12-19; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. Through the one man's disobedience Rom. v. 19. the many were made sinners, is an alternative expression with "through the trespass

Rom. v. 15. of one the many died.' But as to the mode in which the 'trespass' or 'disobedience' of Adam affected the whole human race, no information is given, and it has puzzled Christian theology for centuries."

"Paul favours the theory of sin being inherent, or has obtained a permanent lodgment—as it suits him for the moment."

"Paul's theology has two elements, the logical and the mystical, which are seldom wholly separated from each other, and it is these elements that have permitted his ideas to be so readily modified or construed or combined as to form the foundation of varied systems of theology; for Paul's variety and complexity of expression, his varying metaphors permit such varied construction that they are readily adaptable to any interpretation in favour of which the student is prepossessed."

"So, too, the liberty that Paul takes, in Phil. iii. 6. directly opposed statements, as 'a righteousness that is in the law,' and, 'By Gal. ii. 16. the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.'"

"So, also, the reasons for the giving of the law, when—as he asserts—it was destined to failure.* These passages allow the conclusion that the law was promulgated to make the

* Gal. iii. 19; Rom. iii. 20; v. 20 and vii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 56.

sinfulness of sin more apparent; or they may be construed to mean to make sin more heinous, though in no way restraining it. Preconceived ideas and temperament of the student leading to either—or any intermediate—conclusion."

His complexity of ideas, in his conception of Christ's mission, is so involved that no consistent reasoner can be guided by them.

"Equally involved and complex—though naturally less contradictory—are Paul's descriptions of the changes in man through the power of Christ."

Resuming his own analyses, the Man continued:

"Noble are his exalted ideas and his descriptions of faith; but these are no indication that he had received a special revelation of the office of Christ; and they furnish no justification for accepting, as a teacher of doctrine, a man whose poetic enthralment leads him to use

* As Sacrifice, 1 Cor. v. 7; Rom. v. 25. (1) Reconciliation, Rom. v. 10, 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. (2) Saved from the wrath of God, Rom. i. 16 and v. 9; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14. (3) Language of purchase of a slave, 1 Cor. vi. 20 and vii. 23. Free from bondage to the law, Gal. iv. 5. (4) Bondage to the elements of the universe or material things, Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 15. (5) To the varied ideas of "acquittal," not justification by God's favour, Rom. iii. 24; by Blood of Christ, Rom. v. 9; Gal. ii. 17; by Faith, Rom. xi. 28 and v. 1; Gal. xii. 8, 24. Mystical union of Christ and men, so that they died with Him and rose with Him, Rom. vi. 3-10; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. ii. 5, 6; Col. ii. 12.

any terms that serve the moment; terms that illustrate or vivify the emotion—not conviction—that absorbs him; till a new impulse leads him to another flight of sentiment.

"His intense love of polemics, his intellectual pride, were constantly leading him away from his really dominant conviction, that righteousness, 'a conscience void of offence towards God and man,' is the basis of a true religious life; led him into wild vagaries and illogical reasonings, which have furnished the pretext for countless errors in belief."

From the Pauline quiver the clergyman drew another shaft.

"You have admitted the beauty of St Paul's poetic conceptions. But more than poetical
Gal. iv. imagery is his demonstration of the glorious freedom of the Christian under the gospel and of the Hebrew bondage under the law; using as illustration Isaac, the son of the freewoman, and Ishmael, the son of the bondwoman. Clearly—except to those who are unwilling to be convinced—he demonstrates that the lower plane of genesis of the law must be followed by failure to attain to other than bondage, because it was of that which the bondwoman was a fitting type; while freedom waited on the later birth which came of the liberty in Christ Jesus which the freewoman represented."

And the Man answered:

"Let me complete Paul's illustration, 'Now this Hagar, is Mount Sinai.' But it was on Mount Sinai that the commandments were divinely delivered which included 'Honour thy father and thy mother.' Surely that which Paul denounced as the bondage of the law ought not to be the system of ethics which God gave on Sinai, and which our Lord sanctioned so clearly. That which oppressed Paul was—or ought to have been—the accretions of tradition. But why did not Paul denounce these? Why did he not join our Lord in His denouncing the traditions of which the brutality of the immunity from filial obligation in *Corban* was the natural result?

"Paul was so steeped in Pharisaical perversity that he could not dissociate all that was ethical and humane in the law as divinely given, from the perversions which had been made by those whose works of the law had been instituted solely to foster their pride of exclusiveness and to display their supercilious sense of spiritual superiority.

"Hence his figure was poetical—and only that; in no sense an apt illustration. A true inspiration would have made him superior to this pharisaical enthralment.

"But if you insist on taking Paul seriously

in his reasoning from those premises, I must ask you to regard first its inconsistency, and secondly its consequences.

"The reasoning is illogical; for to Isaac's posterity—the descendants of the freewoman—was given the law which, as Paul asserts, was to put them—not the children of Ishmael—in bondage. The latter were to be free from the condemnation of sin, because Paul had established—to his own satisfaction at least—that only by the knowledge of the law could sin be imputed.

"But I have dwelt so much on Paul's inability to reason logically that I will not continue this topic, but pass to the consideration of that which is of far graver moment than were his futile attempts at logical demonstration; namely, the consequences of his misdirected reasoning.

"Already I have called your attention to Paul's habit of introspection, and to his consequent viewing through the refracting media of his own convictions the presumed motives and methods of reasoning of those to whom he appealed.

"Unfortunately for Paul's thesis of bondage under the law, and of glorious freedom under the gospel, the consequence was drawn by the Greek and Grecized converts that the immunity from temptations—to which the law alone had given rise and power, and had made sinful the

yielding to—had been so established by dying to the law, and being a new creature in Christ Jesus, that sense could no longer wield a seductive power."

"The shock to Paul, when he learned of the dreadful immoralities practised in his cherished church at Corinth, must have been a terrible one.* Thenceforth it ought to have been clear to him, as probably it was to unimpassioned onlookers, that faith conferred no immunity from vices of the grossest description; nay, more, that the fatal doctrine of the superseding of the moral law was bound to lead to the most sinister consequences, and would actually be taken as an encouragement to every kind of license. In vain the apostle 'writhed and twisted' to escape the difficulty he had himself created; in vain did he reason that faith, emancipation from the law, not only produced, but *was*, a state of emancipation from sin, and that they in whose members sin still bore dominion had not real faith. Who was to gainsay the fervid self-assurance of anyone who chose to protest his faith, together with his conviction that he was superior to the restrictions of the law? Had not Paul himself plainly hinted that sin is not
Rom. v. 13. imputed where there is no law, and that he himself 'had not known sin, except

* J. Warschauer in *New World*.

Rom. vii. 7. through the law'? He might lay down, as indeed he did, the most explicit ethical injunctions, commending a godly, righteous and sober life; but what more natural than that his hearers preferred the part of his teaching which deprecated righteousness by works and described the law as the strength of sin?

"The Corinthian scandals were only the fitting prelude to a series of phenomena which, through the whole history of Christianity, never failed to manifest themselves where the Pauline doctrine obtained a serious hold.* 'A hideous shadow of antinomianism has dogged it throughout all time. It was manifest in the immoral sects of the apostolic period; . . . it lingered on through the Middle Ages; it burst into febrile heat at the Reformation among the Anabaptists of Munster, and the Adamites and other obscene sects; and all these appealed to the *argument* of Paul and away from his *injunctions*.' In the canon itself we are told of some who wrested the teachings of Paul 'to

2 Pet. iii. 16. their own destruction'; of some who turned 'the grace of God into lasciviousness';

Jude iv. of a prophetess who taught believers 'to commit fornication and eat things

Rev. ii. 20. sacrificed unto idols.'

"Must we not read these passages in the

* Baring-Gould, *Study of St Paul.*

light of Paul's own sorrowful admission that
1 Cor. v. 1. there reigned in that Church such immorality as was not even among the Gentiles. The charges of shameless debauchery constantly made against the early Church—and occasionally admitted by writers like pseudo-Clement, Tertullian and Irenæus—all point equally to the widespread mischief wrought by the doctrine of justification by faith; and well might the writer whom we have been quoting observe: 'The Church trembled on the verge of becoming an immoral sect. *It was high time that the gospels should appear*, and show that Christ had given His sanction to the moral law; nay, had extended its application.'"

"Yet all the more willingly," the Man added, "I pay heartfelt tribute to Paul's attempts to free himself from these sad complications. Paul's 'faith that worketh through love' is the perfect definition of exalted Christian sentiment. Still, if his dying with Christ to the law of the flesh, to live with Christ to the law of the mind, is regarded as other than poetical—is taken literally, and not as dying to sin in absorbing love to Christ—we make Him anthropomorphic and lay the foundation for misconceptions. For it is impossible to accept Paul's thesis of divinity dying to sin."

"Then you practically deny that Paul was

divinely called to apostleship," the clergyman said.

"Not quite so strongly as that; for the evidence is only negative. 'Not proven,' I would say, since Paul's evidence is not consistent with itself in its various and differing repetitions. Especially questionable is his last account of it; for there he attributes to our Lord language and methods of thought which are so unmistakably Pauline that they establish a profound distrust of the accuracy of this account; moreover, it is unlike the previous accounts—and these do not agree with each other.

"Again: it was inconsistent with the words of our Lord; inconsistent, too, with the tenor of His life—if I rightly understand them—that He should have chosen such a man as Saul of Tarsus to be the chief apostle. But I do deny his claim to a divine inspiration which modified and augmented the teachings of our Lord.

"To me there is nothing more pathetically appealing in His history than His washing of the disciples' feet; nothing more prophetic than His appeal not to put the new wine of His revelations of divine love into the old wine skins of rabbinical theology. He doubtless foresaw that pride of power and intellectual

vanity would be the rocks on which His Church would be wrecked.

"Powerless to avert this He doubtless saw He would be; opposed, as He recognized that He was, by the malign influence of him whose 'kingdom is . . . of this world'; while His calm endurance of that humiliating powerlessness cannot but inspire a loftier regard for the loveliness of the divine motive which accepted this added humiliation.

"But Saul of Tarsus was foremost in confining of the new Christ wine in the old Hebrew theological wine skins. And they burst, as the Lord foretold: and all through the pages of the history of the Church the splashes fell. There they have left their red stains: and we call one 'St Bartholomew's night'; one 'the reign of Bloody Mary,' and so on."

VII

"But in making this charge you forget how zealous Paul was that the law, at once and with no reservation, should be superseded by the faith in Christ. He was insistent that the law had been tried and had been found powerless to establish a true religious life," the clergyman interposed.

"No, I do not forget; but here again I appeal for faith in a consistent Christ, as against credulity in an impetuous and inconsistent Paul. Where has our Lord left any evidence that He wished that the Mosaic law should be abruptly abrogated? Almost His last act before His death was the observance of the Passover. And although it was instituted as a type of Himself, it would have been natural that He should have wholly substituted for it the Last Supper—if He had desired that at once the law should be made a nullity.

"But we have the direct testimony of our Lord: 'The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all things whatsoever they bid you these do and observe'; and you know that this is by no means the only positive utterance of our Lord which Paul acted contrary to when he made such violent attacks on the law. The parable of the tares and the wheat —the danger of violently uprooting the tares— would seem to refer to the peril of making attacks on the law.

"But to go back to the figure of the wine skins of Hebrew theology, into which Paul proposed to force the untheological message of our Lord.

"Why does the Church pretend to be blind, for really blind it cannot be, to the coarse materialism of the rabbinical theology which

possessed Paul and which he has infused into the Christian faith?

"Rabbinical theology had lost, if it ever really possessed, a real knowledge of the essential spirit of sacrifice. The giving up of the best that we possess; the rendering back to God of the life that vivified it, in token of our recognition that all we have is from His hand: this true inward dedication Paul could not comprehend; and so he could teach only an asserted potency in the material sacrifice; in the actual shedding of blood. That this erroneous sacrificial spirit possessed him, that there was no recognition by Paul of the spiritual devotion of a true sacrificial motive, are evidenced by his making no allusion to that most beautiful and impressive instance of absorbing self-renunciation that the Old Testament records.

"But in Abraham's readiness to sacrifice his only son there was none of that actual outpouring of blood which Paul demanded in the idea of completed sacrifice. Paul's silence in this is all the more startling, when we recall that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to it.

"Nor could Paul recognize the spiritual figure of that other impressive form of sacrifice, in which the scapegoat was driven out into the

wilderness: a type so suggestive of our Lord's being driven out into the wilderness to combat with the power of darkness, that we can well believe it was thus foreshadowed. His omission of reference to the smiting of the rock in the wilderness—the type of our Lord's riven side—is also suggestive. Here were symbols so striking, so full of poetical analogy, that it would seem as if Paul's highly poetical spirit could not fail to recognize the beauty and appropriateness of the similitudes.

"Yet if one is a careful student of Paul he cannot fail to find, in Paul's blood blindness to any sacrifice which was not material, the reason of his blindness to the impressive appositeness of these types. That in sacrifice there appealed to Paul only what the 'outward man' could recognize, ought to be almost conclusive evidence that his inspiration existed only in his own imagination.

"It is Paul's coarse view of sacrifice which has degraded the theology of the Church; which has doubtless laid the foundation of much of its terrible cruelties, and naturally led to his imputing to the Father a satisfaction in the shedding of the blood of His divine Son."

"But Paul recognizes the need—the transforming power—of a true sacrificial spirit, when

he exhorts us to present our bodies a living sacrifice," the clergyman suggested.

"I admit that he presents this most beautifully and appealingly—as a preacher. But as a theologian, as a teacher of the relations of the divine to the human, he is not able to comprehend a true sacrificial spirit, because he possesses no degree of inspiration to incite him to rise above his rabbinical education.

"Do not think me insensible to the beauty and sincerity of Paul's appeals for Christlikeness, for self-consecration, for identification with Christ through dying with Him. Let me forget his intrusive personality, his illogical reasoning, his impulsive inconsistency, and no one more than I will praise the lofty sentiments to which he gave expression in his best moments.

"You will comprehend me when I characterize Paul as intensely fond of colour. In his brilliant thought-painting he was an impressionist.

"His artistic sense was so dominating that it impelled him to vivify his theme through every tint which he could employ. He delighted in the varying shades that each colour afforded. A striking illustration of this we find at the close of the first chapter of Romans; the latter part of the fifth chapter of Galatians is yet another. Yet his artistic taste was so pure that his brilliancy never approached bizarre effects. But

to expect accurate drawing, a true sense of proportion, correct perspective, would be unnatural: and most of all would we be disappointed if we looked for historical accuracy.

"For he who would enter into judgment on Paul, and yet cannot enter into Paul's artistic heart and view his glowing pictures from that coign of vantage, in earnest sympathy with his æsthetic emotions, must do Paul a grave injustice; and—more gravely important—will lose the *rapport* through which will be illuminated for him Paul's limitations.

"And yet, over against this idealizing imagination, we find its unexpected antithesis in the hard, unyielding literalness—the fruitage of his rabbinical education, which his morbid introspection intensified.

"It is just here that we find the overpowering influence of his false education.

"In spite of his true poetic instincts, in the face of a really earnest desire to reform his theological views into the mould of Christ revelation, they had ceased to be plastic; and so his subsequent convictions must be bent—no matter with what violence and unnaturalness—to meet the conformations of his old rabbinical theology. This is strikingly evident in his treatment of the Jewish scriptures, when cited for the purpose of illustration.

"We would expect that his own strong poetic instincts would recognize and intensify the poetic idealism of their thought. Instead of that, he invests them with a cold, hard realism which our judgment tells us is utterly foreign to the true poetic sentiment of those who uttered them, in the groping after truth in the early dawn.

"But to view it scientifically, why should we expect that any naturalness would result from such a conversion as was his? It saved the church at Damascus from persecution, it filled Paul with terror: but it appealed neither to his intellect nor to his heart."

The clergyman made no direct reply, but said:

"Then you regard St Paul as adding nothing to the power and evidences of Christianity?"

"To the evidences—most assuredly. Even the materialness of Paul's conception of the resurrection of our Lord has historical value. That a man so thoroughly a Pharisee; contemptuous of the chosen of our Lord; absorbed in admiration of his own intellectuality; his thoughts so self-centred that they admitted nothing from without unless irresistibly forced upon his recognition; that such a man was compelled to acknowledge the divinity of our Lord makes him a most valuable witness to

the validity of the claims of the founder of Christianity: a witness all the more convincing because his whole mind and soul rebelled against surrendering to the conviction to which he gave expression.

"I conceive that the constant struggling of this revulsion was the cause of 'what I would not that I do'; which brought to him the depressing feeling that his assertive individuality was dominated, and that he was only an impassive battle-ground on which two opposing forces —wholly outside of himself—were contending. It would be a charitable view of Paul's idiosyncrasies, and perhaps as just as it is charitable, to consider his contradictions—both those of doctrine and of sentiment—to be the revulsion of his individuality against his powerlessness to rid himself from the subjugating influences of his new belief. This revulsion doubtless had its origin in the intellectual vanity which refracted all external evidence out of its natural plane.

"Thus the key to Paul's abnormal mental condition may be indicated in his humiliating admission that he was possessed by uncontrollable impulses. His standard was noble, but his impulses dominated him, and he was swayed by his self-centred thoughts which were the results of his intense conviction of his own importance. In Phariseeism this conviction

found congenial exercise; the passivity of self-renunciation in Christ was wholly foreign to his nature.*

"It was Christ's sinlessness which found in Paul's love of righteousness the interpreter to him of Christ's divinity; but no such conviction could have come to Paul through that which was external to himself. So his conversion was through that which was purely personal to himself.

"Hence, too, the law of sin in his members —through his intense self-absorption—made sin seem universal to him; and thus the doctrine of original sin was for him a natural evolution.

"Again: while he was ready to yield to supernatural influences that appealed primarily to his own mind, he readily disregarded whatever other minds presented as revelation. He was one of those men who are so convinced that they are children of destiny, so self-assured that they are born to preponderate and to dominate, that tolerance of the opinion of others is impossible to them. His disobedience to the divine command at Tyre illustrates this.

Acts xxi. 4.

"Such a mind cannot be consistent even

* Neither here, nor elsewhere, do we forget "Paul the aged"; and the softening influences which came to his later years.

with itself. Consequently the impulse of the moment led Paul—led him to establish his theses by half truths, and by statements which were not even consistent with his own previous utterances.

"Paul's utter disregard for consistency is evidence of his unbalanced mind. He advanced the thesis of the saving grace being extended to only a few elect; led up to it through a course of false reasoning, which no clear intellect would sanction. But when a different mood possesses him he clearly states that, 'whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved,' and, 'God is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe.' It is needless to point out that every shade of belief, from Calvinism to Universalism, can find its vindication in such contradictory statements of doctrine."

Here the clergyman suggested that every great leader in thought, who has commanded the homage of men, has been invested with a strong personality which arrested attention, yet could not have retained it unless he was actuated by sincere motive in delivering his message, and an absorbing conviction of its truth; and asked:

"How, then, do you account for the permanency of Paul's power, if you deny his inspiration?"

To this the Man replied:

"I think that opportunity had much to do with this, for I cannot concede that Paul possessed an attractive personality—except so far as an assertive boldness attracts a certain class of minds. He was fortunate in his historian; fortuitous circumstances, doubtless, contributed to the preservation of Paul's writings.

"In religion, as in politics, a bold initiative commands a recognition of its claims; hence the very boldness of Paul's claims to special revelations is calculated to carry conviction. His doctrine of sacrificial atonement; the defining of all that made it necessary, all that limits its efficacy, all that determines the bounds of its manifestations; these were advanced with such positive claims that they were divinely revealed to him that they commanded belief. Hence we may regard them as blasphemous impositions, or accept them as the teachings of one divinely inspired—regardless of the stultifying ourselves through accepting as consistent the contradictory terms in which they are expressed. There is no escape from accepting one or the other of these conclusions, except by charitably demonstrating that Paul was mentally irresponsible.

"He had few of the elements of a noble

character. Courage can hardly be attributed to an apostle who ten times fled from danger. Consistency and courage both were absent when, in the face of his contempt for the law, he shifted his principles in his last visit to Jerusalem, boasting that he was a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee, and readily accepting the suggestion that he show that 'thou also walkest orderly and keepest the law.' Thus principle was laid aside for caution—which was too tardy to secure safety.

"And while he could rebuke Peter sharply for showing consideration for the commands of the law, Paul did not hesitate to circumcise Timothy, that he might win the favour of Judean Christians; although he said, 'Behold Gal. v. 2. I, Paul, say unto you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing'; and he performed vicarious vows to conciliate the unbelieving Jews."

Here the clergyman interrupted, saying:

"Most strenuously I protest against your assumption that St Peter was necessarily in the right, and that Paul alone was to blame. That which you are pleased to call Paul's egotism and self-sufficiency was only his natural and just indignation because his work had been interfered with by the Judaizers with whom Peter appears to have been in sympathy." In

the silence that followed this protest by the clergyman he was sanguine that he had gained the advantage.

At length, slowly and with an effort at self-command, the Man resumed:

"I know that you are conversant with all of the conditions of this incident. On the other hand, I would not wish to think that you had intentionally suppressed any of the related circumstances.

"That none of the elder apostles gave encouragement to the Judaizers at Antioch, but rather rebuked them—when Paul and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem—is *prima facie* evidence that Paul's complaint was unjust, and that he took an exaggerated view of whatever leniency Peter may have shown to converts from Judaism.

"But the crux of the whole matter—the cause of inevitable antagonism to Peter—would seem to be evidenced by Paul's assertion that Peter and Barnabas did 'not walk uprightly according to the gospel.'"

"Now we know that Paul always meant by 'gospel' that which he called 'my gospel,' and that he was opposed to what he called 'another gospel.' Surely 'another gospel' from that which Paul preached is the gospel which is revealed by the evangelists. Collision

was inevitable between Peter, who bore this gospel, and Paul, who boasted of 'my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ,'—here, as elsewhere, giving precedence to himself, rather than to our Lord.

"Now if it is orthodox to recognize that there is only one personage worthy of credence in the New Testament, namely, Paul, and only one in the Old Testament, Isaiah, then you are doubtless theologically correct. For Paul's 'my gospel,' of purchase of divine favour and of the appeasing of divine wrath by the sacrificial death of the Christ, had its first intimation in Isaiah—and not with him, till the post-exilian period.

"If Paul was right, then the record of the evangelists was imperfect. If Isaiah was right, we ought to relegate the other prophets to an obscurity merited by their ignorance. And let us eliminate all of the joyous psalms, whose delight in the law of the Lord reflected the almost universal Hebrew love for, as well as pride in, the law.

"It is theologically convenient, but it is not historical, to attribute to the whole Jewish nation the morbid view of the law which Paul and his sect possessed; and held with it such contempt for those who did not share their distorted views, that the treatment which Paul

received at Jerusalem clearly indicates that his caricature of the law was resented, and that it also made him powerless to win any of his nation to believe in his caricature of the true gospel. You know that Paul was not representative of the Jewish nation, or of its faith. Representative of those who held censorious pride in the traditional accretions of the law Paul was—and this alone. And who knows but that our Lord had prophetically in mind that Pharisee who guarded the garments of those who slew His first martyr, when He denounced the moral and spiritual blindness of that sect."

"Unbounded in his contempt of the law, but continuously availing himself of the fruits of its teaching; for you know that the great majority of Paul's converts were those who had already been converted from the Gentiles to the worship of the true God, by the influence of the synagogues; where Paul reaped where others had sown the knowledge of, and belief in, Jehovah.

"With strange inconsistency he used the synagogues of Asia, till he was driven out of them, although he claimed precedence as an apostle to the Gentiles.

"I think that we have the key to much that

otherwise would be obscure in the personality of Paul, if we will regard the many evidences of how little of affectionate regard he
1 Cor. xvi. 17. commanded. At Ephesus he did not secure the affection of the Christian converts; at least his support there—surely to a great degree—came from without.

"He lays much stress on his lack of local support, and he tries to have this indifference to himself regarded as an evidence of his devotion to duty. But is it not more natural to regard it as evidence that, while his authority was acknowledged, he did not elicit the love of the converts?

"Not till after Titus had done his own missionary work in Corinth was Paul welcomed.
2 Cor. vii. 7. Then, on his third visit, he was able to command a hospitable reception following Titus' preaching. And he emphasizes this weakness when he says: 'This thou
2 Tim. i. 15. knowest, that all that are in Asia
iv. 10-16. turned away from me'; and, 'At my first defence no one took my part; but all forsook me.' 'For Demas hath forsaken me and Crescens and Titus: only Luke is with me.' And he asks for Mark, 'for he is profitable unto me.' His self-centred thought is shown in his phrasing of this last sentence.

"His inability to attach to himself faith-
Phil. ii. 21. ful assistants is further shown: for excepting Timotheus and Epaphroditus 'all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's.' And Epaphroditus was 'nigh unto death,' 'to supply your lack of service unto
Phil. iv. 18. me': yet he writes of having received at the hands of Epaphroditus the gifts of the Philippians which were 'a sacrifice
Phil. iv. 10. acceptable, well pleasing to God,' but received after much delay, and no other
Phil. iv. 15. Church had given to him 'in the beginning of the gospel.'

"'The success and steadfastness of the Thessalonian Church came with the preaching of Timothy,' whom Paul had sent when he was 'Satan hindered'—a term that his intense conviction of his own importance prompts him to use repeatedly.

"We would have a right to expect that the scholarly acquirements which are claimed for Paul would have wrought some permanent results at Athens. Later, when a true scholarship had added its philosophical appeals, the Greek mind elsewhere was attracted to Christianity. But Paul's scholasticism could not arouse their interest.

"If Paul had been divinely inspired he would

not have held such erroneous views of the nearness of the Parousia, as shown in 1st Thessalonians; and which he, or some wiser writer, had to correct in the next epistle.

"As poetical—only imaginative, in no way inspired—can we regard Paul's description of the second coming of our Lord, so variously are described the conditions attending that event. So, too, after the Advent. The statement, 'in Christ shall all be made alive,' cannot be reconciled with the 'eternal destruction from the face of the Lord.' And while in places it is taught that the destruction will be immediate, it is elsewhere taught by him that our Lord will reign as the longed-for Jewish Messiah; and during this reign He would 'put all enemies under His feet.'

"His claim to be the apostle to the Gentiles Acts xv. 7. is in opposition to St Peter's statement that 'a good while ago God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth,' etc., and St Peter's evidently extended journeyings would seem to sustain his claim."

Then earnestly the clergyman urged in Paul's behalf:

"It occurs to me that you wilfully ignore the noble characteristics of Paul. Was he not heroic? Read the record of his labours and

his sufferings. He had nothing to gain, but everything to lose, by his devotion to Christ. Nothing but a firm faith in the truth he proclaimed, and an intense love for its founder, could have inspired and sustained him. Is not this deserving of honour? A man who for love of country endures hardship, suffers loss, and if needful sheds his blood on the battle-field, would be by you deemed worthy of all admiration. Why withhold it from Paul, who, whether mistaken or otherwise, did choose to suffer the loss of all things for Christ."

And the Man replied:

"I fail to see where your appeal can have much force. As I have previously observed, his frequent avoiding of danger—so strikingly in contrast to the true courage shown by the apostles—and his pusillanimity at Jerusalem, are what we have a right to expect from a man who through fear was impressed with the power of the Christ whom he was persecuting. But we have wandered away from our subject, for we are not discussing the impulses of a zealot, but the claim of Paul that he was the medium of those special revelations which have led the Church to formulate its doctrines on the supposed sanctity of his statements.

"In marked contrast to Paul's looseness of expression is the consistency as well as the

absorbing reverence which the fourth gospel displays.

"Its careful details of the inmost thoughts of our Lord—so far as the human mind can comprehend the divine—makes most significant the omission of all reference to the doctrine of atonement. 'And while the synoptists explain the sacrifice of our Lord as the giving of His life as a ransom for many, the fourth gospel presents only the metaphor of the Good Shepherd giving His life for His sheep, and attempts no solution of the mystery.'

"'The intense spirituality of the fourth gospel,' 'the whole Gospel breathing a supernatural atmosphere,' 'its instinctive perception of symmetry in thought and expression,' the tenderness with which it displays the love of our Lord, these do not become any less attractive to us through asserted doubts of its authorship. It not only tells us of Christ, it *is* Christ. And even if we regard the censorious criticism, that its elevated spirituality was attained by one who had not actually known our Lord, had never been influenced by His divine personality, it is all the more a tribute to His divinity, all the more an evidence of His absorbing love for mankind, if such rapt devotion, such living in Christ, could be possessed by one who never had witnessed

personally the divine charm of that intense blending of the human and the heaven-born love which filled the soul of the author of the fourth gospel, as it has vivified no other human heart before or since.

"In the message of that gospel I place my hope of heaven.

"It is a noble casket in which are displayed the words which are radiant, above all others, with the love of our Lord. 'I go to prepare a place for you . . . that where I am ye may be also.'

"Before these words I stand appalled. I can express it in no other way.

"Eternity of loving prevision; eternity of sharing a beatitude that can satisfy divinity. Had He come on earth and delivered only this message, it would have sufficed for the perfect revelation of a love that passes human comprehension.

"I would not minimize ruthlessly the faith that the Church reposes on Calvary. Yet most emphatically I would refuse to follow the Church's example, in its ignoring of the plain doctrinal teachings of the Spirit, when it led out our Lord to the temptations in the wilderness, ignoring, too, the doctrinal teachings of the early centuries of the Church, that our Lord's mission on earth was a ransom paid

to Satan 'even to the slavery of the Cross.'

"Some time the Church will have the courage to accept those teachings of the Spirit —which our Lord repeatedly and so plainly emphasized—and will relegate the poet Paul to his own sphere of brilliant irresponsibility."

Confidently the clergyman demanded:

"Surely you will not deny that the wonderful vision of another world which was granted to Paul was evidence of the divine favour; such evidence as was granted to no other apostle, and that it entitles him to reverence. More than that, it was confirmation of apostleship so convincing that it places his divine calling beyond question."

"Granted to no other apostle," the Man replied; "I admit that. I truthfully say that I rejoice—for their sakes—that it was not given to the chosen of our Lord. For I do not wish to think you to be so ignorant of the history of monasticism that you do not know how constantly those zealots—underfed with bread and ideas—were seeing and hearing 'unspeakable things,' which they promptly showed to be exceedingly utterable, in the eagerness with which they published the—believed —evidences of the divine favour shown to them.

Mohammed, equally with Paul, was favoured with visions.

"But I am very glad that you introduced this claim of divine favour bestowed in special revelations; and we must remember that Valentinus—the spiritual grandson of Paul—had special revelations, on which he based his vagaries of imagination and his heresies.

"It is evident that in its introduction, the author of the fourth gospel was rebuking a nascent spirit of Gnosticism. The modern Martinist system is the offspring of that Gnosticism which teaches that 'the Being of Beings, who is the supreme First Cause, is manifested only by his Word, through whom everything was made,' yet 'Satan is the rebellious spirit whose lust for personal independence brought about his separation from God.' Now, we can follow him thus far; but when the Martinist adds the claim that Satan corresponds to the Word of God, the creating thought of God, we must diverge—even though our Lord so plainly admits Satan's claim to independent power in this world; and further, by His silence, seemed to acquiesce to this latter claim, when Satan offered to confer on Him that power, which he held as 'Prince of this world,' if He would worship him.

"Now these Martinist views include much that was taught in the apocalyptic literature which, in the last centuries before Christ, passed under the name of Enoch; for Enoch refers to angels being cast down from the fifth heaven to the second heaven.

"Hence it is most significant that in Paul's description of his vision he claims to have entered the third heaven. So, too, Paul speaks of Christ's reconciling to Himself 'the things Col. i. 20. which are in heaven.' It does not necessarily follow that Paul was imbued with the beliefs of the Gnostics, the theories of the secrets of Enoch, or that he was in sympathy with those early heresies which have their modern expression in the modern Martinist system. Yet it is incumbent on his defenders to present some reasonable theory for his evident belief in conditions which were essential elements in these systems, and which have no warrant in the teachings of our Lord. So we have a right to ask, Why did Paul assert the plurality of heavens, and that in them—at least in one of them—were spirits that needed to be reconciled to Christ? It is not proven by these instances that Paul accepted Plato's and Pindar's beliefs in the fall of man's soul from the Deity, or that the secrets of Enoch coloured his imagination. Yet it presents a reasonable basis

on which to begin investigation of his erratic theological views which bear such similitude to those teachers."

To this the clergyman replied that he was not convinced that the chain of reasoning was convincing, and that he would give it further thought, adding :

"Do you wish it to be understood that you regard as mentally incompetent, or intellectually dishonest, all who hold Paul to be an inspired man, and his teachings as worthy of acceptance?"

And the Man replied :

"I disclaim any such discourteous intent. But I do claim that they are not so courageous as the issues at stake demand. It is a characteristic of fear that it eliminates other motives. And worse than that, it persuades its captives to dignify it with all sorts of Latin derivatives, which represent recognized virtues. You theologians do not dare to trust the divinely-implanted impulses which create the soul's need to acquire divine truth. It flatters your sense of self-importance to indicate that the only path which leads to divine truth passes over the artificial way which you have elaborated ; and that this way is a trestle work ; and you fear that if from this there be taken one brace or chord or sill, your complex

structure will collapse, and the chasm between man and divine truth will never be bridged again.

"But there is no chasm—only the phantasm of one, which you have created.

"And when science comes and points out that this beam or that string piece is decayed or cross-grained, and can support no weight but is weakening the structure, you shut your ears to its warning; just as you disregard the multitude of thoughtful men who know that science speaks truly; and these you are turning back, just as you would have turned me back if my profession had not taught me to think for myself; had not my great need impelled me to seek the truth in the face of your discouragement.

"Shutting your eyes, too, to that lesson which history has continued to teach—from Amos down to St Francis d'Assisi—that out from the people God must send the prophet to rebuke the priest, and to teach him his tendency to error or to apathy.

"Will you never learn to look within your own hearts; that you may recognize the dangers that lie in the entrenched solitude of your studies?

"From all sides—even from sects most

tenacious of the Pauline doctrine—there comes the plaint that clergy and laity are denying fundamental truths of Christian doctrines: the faith in the immaculate conception of our Lord, and in His resurrection. You and I know that such denial is unscientific, since the ability to make such denial implies, at the outset, a thorough knowledge of the fundamental principles of biology. Moreover, only he may make such denial who carries in his brain the dynamometric power which enables him to measure the Divine creative dynamics and to ascertain their utmost power; and next, by a course of reasoning which is incomprehensible to the ordinary mind—and only reasoning, since actual test of that degree of power is apparently impossible—he must demonstrate that the ultimate extent of this creative power falls short of the degree of creative energy needed to establish the germ of life primarily in a woman.* While intelligent denial of the resurrection of our Lord is impossible, till man possesses the knowledge that the portals by which the soul leaves the body are so irrevocably closed in death that He who placed the soul within those portals cannot conduct it back again to its former dwelling-place; and a

* The American oyster and the Portuguese oyster are the products of unsexual conception.

knowledge of how the soul originally entered the body would seem essential to successfully asserting that the body cannot again receive it after a brief separation.

"But these men are as earnest thinkers as you and I are. Hence you and I have no right to condemn them—surely not you theologians who have put before them the temptations to doubt."

The clergyman was loyal to the faith that he had received, and advanced the argument.

"It seems most unjust that you should charge us with tempting men to doubt, when we devote our lives to teaching the truths which have been tested for centuries and have never been found wanting. Would you renew the heresies of the early Church, heresies that doubtless wrought its downfall, at least in the Eastern Church?"

Then the Man replied:

"Heresy is a word of such varied meaning —as you study it subjectively or objectively— that I must ask you to excuse me from answering your question in a direct way; yet I still believe that the encouragement to much of what you call heresy is to be found in the writings of Paul.

"Yet, if I have no quarrel with those who

reject the doctrines which we regard as essential to belief in the divinity of the Christ —doctrines which my limited studies have led me to believe in, which my experience in evidence permits me to recognize as natural and consistent—it is because these men demand nothing from me. They recognize that their investigations are made in that same imperfect light in which the science of chemistry groped a century ago.

"The advocates of the higher criticism recognize that they are in the period of the phlogiston; of chemical decomposition; and that there will come the period of chemical combination, when the fires of a pure devotion will not burn with less of warmth because they are fed intelligently.

"As I said, these men make no demands on me. They do not tell me that I can find the way of truth, only by accepting the guidance of a mind so disordered as was that of Saul of Tarsus; one-half of whose utterances it is necessary to ignore in order to believe the other half.

"But in considering much of the arguments and conclusions of those who seek truth by what is known as higher criticism, I am impelled to a choice of one of two positions. First, that they possess intellects so vastly superior to

mine that they can recognize as conclusive proof that which seems to me to be only arbitrary denial on their part. The second possible condition is that, having grown to be hypercritical, they are too academic, and do not regard the practical conditions that modify all evidence; do not recognize that probabilities are all that we can attain to in most of our attempts at demonstration; and most of all, do not favourably regard as collateral evidence that responsiveness to the needs of mankind, which is afforded by those influences which have their seat in beliefs which are founded on evidences which the higher criticism alleges are without adequate historicity.

"Slow enough has been the advance in ethical and altruistic conditions. Yet, justly it seems to me, there may be demanded of the higher criticism that its keen, incisive reasoning demonstrate that through all the centuries of Christianity, these conditions would have been more widely, more highly developed, if critical scholarship had eliminated at the outset all which it claims is not demonstrable in the foundation of those beliefs which apparently have promoted the advance in those ethical and altruistic conditions. I am ready to regard the possible objections, that these developments of beneficent influences are not proofs of the truth of

those beliefs that are claimed as the source of those beneficent influences, since coincidence does not prove their relation to each other; and in taking this position scholarship would be correct academically.

"But the conditions of the demand are unchanged. It seems a just demand that higher criticism demonstrate what would be the present status of ethical and altruistic conditions, if the negations which scholarly criticism foster had been prevalent and potent, had been established ever since Christianity was founded. The ordinary mind entertains such profound respect for the mental capacity of the advanced thinkers, that the latter would be regarded as avoiding a fair test, if this demand is ignored.

"Nevertheless, the ordinary mind is not inclined to oppose itself to that practical appeal —the probability of the truth of the opposite of this contention of higher criticism; nor can it reconcile with the law of probabilities that the sacrificial Life should have created for itself so imperfect and so indistinct a recollection that they who were its witnesses did not convey a reasonably correct account of His acts and language—even if that account was at first only oral: and we must not forget the wonderful training of memory in which every Jewish child

was disciplined, in that memorizing of the law which was transmitted verbally and with accuracy.

"It is 'the man in the street' to whom I shall make my appeals for a just recognition of the divinity of the Man of Galilee. I wish to be equipped to meet his methods of estimating the value and the truth of evidence in general. Moreover, he is the man who would augment your Church, if you would take the trouble to study him.

"But this man is eminently practical. He demands of religion that it guide its possessor safely past the dangers of moral shipwreck in a horse trade; and that when it conveys consolation to the widow and the fatherless it put a bag of potatoes under the wagon seat.

"He cannot make the nice distinctions between dogma and doctrine, and so he is unable to understand how the Gospel according to St John 'was written with a dogmatic purpose,' because its language is opposed to the prevalent Pauline doctrine.

"He cannot successfully argue the proposition, but, if you have enlisted his heart on your side, he cannot be convinced that the early martyrs gave their lives in devotion to one whose divinity was only dubiously attested: and though no student of history, he will not

believe it probable that the malignity of Roman emperors would have been directed against the followers of one whose claims to divinity had no sound historical attestation—who was only the carpenter of Nazareth.

"This man will recognize that these persecutors had at their command sources of information other than Galilean fishermen, and were too much absorbed in pleasure and in the momentous interest of their vast empire, to make it probable that they would give any attention to a band of fanatics who were eminently non-resistant, unless those emperors felt that a real, though invisible, danger lurked beneath that non-resistance. Cruel by nature of their position were those persecutors; but it was fear—prophetic fear, as time soon proved—that actuated them. Fear that doubtless had its source in the knowledge of the supernatural power of the Master of those fanatics; and that knowledge of His power was frequently recognized by those whom the Roman emperor had placed in power in Judea.

"That this 'man in the street' does not possess the scholarship which enables him to stamp any alleged fact as improbable, solely because it cannot command an unbroken train of historical evidence, can be regarded as a

defect which time may correct. Yet, on the other hand, he has seen—perhaps painfully experienced — the deceptiveness of circumstantial evidence and of inferences, so that he will place little value on the deductions of scholars when they urge negations which are the result of reasonings which are academic. Moreover, the illustration of the material trinity of steam, snow and ice, and their resolving into the 'headship' of water, from which each may be evolved with its own distinctive 'essence,' will suffice to teach him the consistency of the doctrine of the Divine Trinity.

"This man, whom you ought to seek to win, is not inclined to honour demands on his credulity, yet he has the mental capacity to recognize the weakness of the argument of the higher criticism against the probability of miracles, that the question is not 'What can God do?' but 'What does He do?'

"But when this practical man sees plant life change all the form, structure, development, which it has inherited through countless generations, that it may stretch itself up to the sunlight from the pit where it has been unnaturally placed; developing with an effectiveness which indicates the exertion of adaptive intelligence —within itself or from without; or when he regards the expansion by cold, of that element

which is the most expansive by heat, and studies the disastrous results, if ice were to follow the general law that heat expands and cold contracts; this practical man has not the acumen to comprehend the asserted limitations of the divine adaptive power, for he cannot understand the claim of higher criticism that this exercise of adaptive intelligence is exerted for material results only, and that it cannot, or will not, be used in demonstrating—through miracles—that the limitations of divine power are incomprehensible by the human intellect. Consequently, he cannot intelligently follow that course of induction, by which the student of advanced theology can convince himself that miracles are improbable.

"But you lay side by side the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Galatians, and you expect men to believe both. For, in your stern determination to maintain the dicta of Paul, you are reckless of inviting distrust of both records—through the opposition of each to the other. And then, when men have learned that lesson of distrust, you wonder that they go on to doubt essentials.

"Will the time ever come that you will be content to teach the simple creed of a natural God and a consistent gospel? For that gospel

can never be consistent, while you demand belief in statements diametrically opposed to one another.

"Doubtless there are some comparisons and analyses which demand a knowledge of theology, at least of philology, and of the original text. But it requires only a reasonable knowledge of the principles of evidence, to compare the testimony of Acts and of Galatians. The account in the early part of Acts appears to be a quotation from some other author by the historian of Paul. An evident and convincing consistency pervades that part. Its language and thought are just what we have a right to expect from men who had awakened to the greatness of their loss, simultaneously with their awakening to the divine grandeur of the Master; awakened, too, to the responsibility that He had laid upon them.

"Conscious of their human weakness, they are full of conscious power in the strength that He has bequeathed to them. This record of their dignity, their rapt self-abnegation, their noble awe as they recognize their responsibility, bears the impress of truth.

"By the side of this deep, placid stream of thought, you let run the wild, turgid flow of uncurbed emotion that the early chapters of Galatians display. It does not need either

scholar or scientific philologist to recognize that this flow has no higher source than the heart of a man who is chafing under keen personal disappointment. Envy of the apostles has grown almost to hate. Truth is no barrier in the unrestrained rush of chagrin and evident jealousy.

"In other epistles he has shown a degree of chagrin and petulance, because he had not received the personal devotion to which he felt that he was entitled. It would be amusing, if it were not so serious a matter, to witness in those plaints how his personal pride recoils from recognizing the neglect; and how he bestows fulsome praise — which displays its tenuity in the strained terms of a gratitude unnaturally simulated, and which could not for a moment deceive anyone who has made a study of evidence.

"But in this epistle all caution is thrown aside. Unimpeded by actual facts the unguarded statements run. Yet he recognizes that these statements will be sharply challenged —indeed he gives us all the more reason for questioning their truth by his oath, 'Before God I lie not.'

"Pity for the disordered mind is the highest sentiment which these chapters should arouse.

"And yet the Church has been so 'falsely

true' to what it has construed as a divine message, that it has practically told the world that it has so little faith in the convincing power of the great underlying truths of Christianity, that it does not dare to eliminate these statements of a disordered mind; statements which might be ignored, if they did not deny important truths.

"But in its challenge of the truth of the post-resurrection history of the Church at Jerusalem, Paul's language attacks statements which are close to essential truths of Christianity. For if belief in the post-resurrection history is destroyed we must expect that the ante-resurrection history will be questioned. Consequently, to the unquestioning believer, two conditions are presented.

"First: That the doctrines which Paul promulgated are mysteriously essential to a true faith in Christ. Second: That those essential doctrines are inscrutably identified with the personality of Paul. So that all of his utterances—even if involving no question of doctrine—must be accepted as the truth, even if they conflict with the post-resurrection history, regardless of the fact that such conflict invites distrust of the earlier basic history of Christianity.

"Now please tell me if I have stated the case unfairly?

"Yet first, let me examine with you that chain of dogma on which, as you tell me, the Pauline theology is dependent.

"As I recall it, it was in effect as follows: that all mankind having merited eternal death, through the disobedience of our first parents, universal pardon could be obtained only through the sacrificial death of Christ. You elaborated this in four propositions.

"I frankly admit that their sequence is natural, that each succeeding link is the logical conclusion from that which precedes it; and I have only one objection to admitting its power to sustain the dogma which is dependent upon it.

"But the first link, like Mohammed's coffin, is floating in the air, at least to my vision; and when that first link falls the succeeding links must collapse. Nowhere in the teachings of our Lord does it have support, and nowhere in the Old Testament can there be found a sustaining power, though there are two or three sentences of dubious meaning which may be wrested to a semblance of support of the primary dogma."

"No; not a semblance of support," the clergyman said. "A divine hand reaches down and grasps it, through the revelation

vouchsafed to St Paul. That which you contemn —that 'my gospel' which he received, 'not with flesh and blood,' but by direct inspiration, was his authority."

And to this the Man answered:

"When a Mormon elder can obtain an additional wife only by a received revelation; when to a Roman pontiff a coveted additional power can come only through a revelation; or when a Paul must witness the collapsing of the chain of reasoning upon which his whole system of dogma is dependent, unless he can fasten its first link to a revelation, we have a right to consider the frailty of human nature, and to recognize that an intense and longing contemplation of any object of absorbing interest makes the mind—especially a mind so ready to entertain visions as was Paul's—unfitted to discriminate between actual revelation, and a conviction founded on a believed need of establishing a cherished theory. To my mind it is illogical to claim that our Lord should have left so important an element of His mission to be developed at a later period, by any method so unreliable—through opportunities of deception and dangers of self-deception—as are revelations. For my part I find a sufficiency in that

which our Lord alone has taught; and I can find no compensation for the undermining effect of the flood of revelations which have their inception through Paul."

"I challenge your claim," the clergyman interposed, "that the Church's belief in the mediatorial sacrifice of our Lord is founded on the dicta of St Paul. Clearly, in the institution of the communion service, our Lord stated that His death was mediatorial. 'For this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins.'

"The atoning sacrifice could not have been more positively asserted and defined. These words of our Lord are the foundation of St Paul's doctrine of the Divine Sacrifice, and they make St Paul's position unassailable."

"I have been expecting this defence of your position," the Man resumed. "I admit that the language is positive, and if it stood alone would be incontrovertible.

"You have quoted from the Gospel according to St Matthew; but it is noticeable that the other synoptists and St John make no reference to the death of our Lord as an offering for sin—a most significant omission.* Perhaps it is because the

* St Luke's rendering can be construed as indicating that the sacrifice was a ransom—or as mediatorial, as the reader prefers—and it is significant that in many ancient manuscripts it is omitted altogether.

doctrine which you advocate is so repugnant to me, that the words which immediately follow your quotation seem so incongruous with that which we conceive to be the conditions of the Divine existence.

"If we regard those words which you have quoted as unquestionably accurate, if we take them literally, then we must also accept, with the same literalness, that which immediately follows, and which clearly teaches that in heaven our Lord possesses a body so material—moreover, that heaven itself is so material—that there our Lord will drink wine. We may not be able to define our sentiments, but I think that we all revolt from accepting such a material conception of our Lord's existence in heaven.

"Yet this anthropomorphic view we must accept, if we accept as accurate quotation that other portion which you present.

"And there comes as a natural corollary: What other animal appetites are permitted in heaven? Conceding the accuracy of these quotations from St Matthew—and we must concede both if we allow one—how can we logically combat the 'revelation' to the Mormon Church that in heaven Mary and Martha and the Magdalen are the amours of our Lord?

"In reply, I am quite prepared for that theo-

logical 'straddle'—that the first quotation is to be taken literally; the second as only figurative. But in fairness you must also allow the atheist the right to 'straddle'; and then he can quickly demolish the Bible. Moreover, we must remember that there are other words, of equal and contradictory force, attributed to our Lord on that momentous night. 'I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.' If we accept your quotation as literally true, then we must also regard this quotation with the same literalness; although one distinctly negatives the other. But of far greater force was the prayer of our Lord, that the cup of humiliation might 'pass away from Him.' Such a prayer would be thoroughly incongruous if mediatorial sacrifice on the Cross was essential for the salvation of the human race; if only by the shedding of His blood could Divine justice be satisfied. Then, too, there confronts us the question, Why did the Church, during its earlier centuries, attach no importance to that which you quote, if our Lord really intended that the doctrine of mediatorial sacrifice should be inculcated? You know that the Church did not accept the Pauline theology till it needed it as the foundation for the priestly sacrifice of the Mass, and you recall that St Augustine, in his *De Trinitate*, presents the *reductio ad absurdum* of

the Pauline doctrine of the Father's demand of sacrifice on the Cross, to satisfy the demands of Divine justice. In common with the other great leaders of the early Church he seems to
1 John iii. have recognized 'that to this end was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.'"

The clergyman faced his visitor for the final struggle.

"You have chosen to establish yourself in a position which is not fortified by Christian experience. You eliminate all that Christian scholarship has vindicated in the writings of St Paul. What will you or I gain by trying to meet on any common ground? You choose to deny so much. I challenge you to any proof of that to which you choose to pay a *quasi* respect. Define to me by what principles of electism you reject as false or accept as true. You accuse Paul of opening the door to heresies; you who are encouraging the atheist, by your denials, to deny the essentials of Christianity. What can you offer to him in proof of Christ's divinity?"

Then the Man calmly replied:

"I offer the evidence of His miracles; they are testimony to the divine sanction of His claims of sharing divinity."

"And if the atheist chooses to follow your example; if he denies the historic accuracy of all of the four gospels, you are powerless to refute him," the clergyman replied.

"Not powerless, and you know it. I plant my defence on the Toledoth Jeschu. By all principles of evidence that attack of His enemies never would have been written, if the miracles had not been supernatural beyond the power of the human intellect to assign a natural cause; indisputable proof it gave, too, that the recording of them was historically reliable."

The Man had risen while making his answer, preparing to end the interview. Each looked into the other's face, and each face expressed something akin to contempt. Surely the clergyman's face reflected his feelings. To defend his position he had assumed the attitude of the atheist. He felt that he was safe in his false position. For twenty years he had taught the accepted truths of Christianity to his charge, and he had measured this man by the same standard which he applied to the intelligence of those to whom he ministered. And now his visitor, who only six months ago was like a little child in trust and submission, had proved him to be a dissimulator. No wonder the clergyman was contemptuous — towards himself — in his

failure to use, successfully, the weapons of the atheist; yet ready to have the contempt construed as anger because his creed had been attacked.

VIII

Soon after his return to his home, this letter was delivered to the Man:—

"Dear Sir,—I fear that you have been actuated not so much by a desire to discover truth, as to weaken my own faith, by your sophistries and intemperate assaults on the authority of a man whom the Church has regarded for centuries as an inspired and able champion of the Christian faith. Calmly I view that universal and undimmed faith in St Paul, as it stretches out in a vista of nearly two thousand years.

"It will require more than you have advanced, in your conversations with me, to shake that confidence in him which I hold, in common with all Christendom. Catholic and Protestant stand together in reverence for St Paul; the most radical divisions on creeds and forms do not weaken this unity.

"I grant that I cannot refute all of your statements and inferences. St Paul may have been egotistical, imperious, proud of his intellectual acquirements; but the impress which he has made on the Christian thought of the ages is not to be obliterated by the charge of insanity.

"Temporarily your assertions and arguments have clouded my mind; but my faith rises above the mists you have called up, and in that I have peace, as myriads of souls have had during the past centuries, and in that I rest.

"Had you succeeded in your evident purpose, I would have been driven to acknowledge that I, and all who teach the theology based on the doctrines of Paul, are teaching lies. What then could I do? I must either continue to teach a lie or to withdraw from the ministry to which I believe myself called of God, and to which I have devoted the best years of my life.

"Did it occur to you what such an uprooting of my faith would cost? If I stood alone it would be bitter, even agonizing.

"But to deny my faith would be to make homeless those whom God has given to me to love and care for. As I write I hear the sound of my crippled daughter's crutch. Every tap of that crutch smites my heart like a blow. She is helpless, shut out from most of the pleasures that should delight her youth,

deprived of the joy that should crown her coming womanhood. The burden lies heavily on that young heart. Shall I make it heavier by depriving her of the comforts which now—though I am only a poor clergyman—my position enables me to command? I have taught her that it is a Father's hand which thus afflicts her, and she is sustained by believing this. The faith which you despise is her strength and support, as it is mine. At your bidding shall I surrender this? No. My lips may not have a ready answer to your arguments. But my heart tells me that it is safer to cling to the teachings of the revered instructors of my youth. I decline to read your communication, because I will not risk the weakening, through that which it may speciously advance, of the faith which my instructors instilled. I believe they knew the truth. I am content to follow their instruction; the fallacies of your reasonings I shall find in due time. Meanwhile I shall pray for you, for I wish to believe that you are sincere in your desire to find the right way.—Faithfully yours,

"James Underwood."

Deliberately the Man re-read the letter, quoting aloud, "'I fear you have been moved . . . by desire . . . to weaken my own faith.'"

There was a trace of sarcasm in his voice as he repeated :

> "*Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us*
> *To see oursels as ithers see us ;*
> *It wad frae mony a blunder free us*
> *And foolish notion.*"

"It seems to me to be a clear case of 'the pot calling the kettle black.' And surely it wasn't I who began this fencing with creeds. It is positively refreshing—the coolness with which he ignores his own attack on my faith. How indifferent he was then to the consequences to me—perhaps through eternity—of his attempt to destroy my faith. And yet, how virtuously indignant he is when I, in turn, attack his theology"

Again he quotes from the letter: "'I view that universal and undimmed faith in Paul, as it stretches out in a vista of nearly two thousand years.'

"Ah, my dear minister, how convenient is a bad memory. For during that same 'nearly two thousand years' the fires of a material hell also have been 'undimmed'; have flashed as luridly as at the beginning of those centuries. And although so recently as is your own childhood that material hell was preached, still you know that to-day you would not presume to

preach that doctrine to any intelligent congregation. Hence—in the light of this radical change of belief during your own lifetime—who are you to assert so positively the permanence of that 'blood doctrine' which Paul has engrafted onto the Christian faith?

"The one error has died out, its lurid fires paling before the light of the Sun of Righteousness. No visible power has dispelled the intervening clouds; but silently they melted away. And since within only a half century these sulphurous flames have ceased to be visible, bold beyond prudence is he who can assert that those Pauline blood stains on the garments of the Father, will not fade away in the light of those same pure rays which subdued the baleful flames of God's imputed wrath."

He read on, and the hard lines in his face were fading; a gentler mood possessed him. Once more he quotes: "'Shut out from the pleasures which should delight her youth.'" "'It is a Father's hand which thus afflicts her.'"

"No; it is not a 'Father's hand.' Every miracle of healing from the hand of our Lord: within ourselves every impulse of tenderness and of pity for those who suffer, gives the lie to this. And more plainly still, 'whom Satan

hath bound; lo, these eighteen years,' is the direct and unqualified refutation by our Lord of this calumny.

"In this attributing her suffering to a loving Father he is not even consistent with his Pauline teaching. For unqualifiedly Paul describes death as an enemy—the last enemy—that Christ is to conquer.

"We have a right to apply here the axiom that 'the greater includes the less'; so it is logical to consider that disease and every disaster originate with that 'enemy'; a power which cannot be an ally or instrumentality of divinity, since it is so inimical that Christ must conquer it.

"How Satan must rejoice in this attributing to God the consequences of his own malignity! Yet what avails the positive statements of our Lord, if they are opposed by the dicta of an established theology? For religion is but the handmaid of theology!

"'Bound, lo, these eighteen years,' nearly, has been this innocent child; and for thrice eighteen years, perhaps, she will be in Satan's leash. Would God that I could find some way to weaken those bonds which make her 'shut out from the joys that should bless.'"

He rose and paced the room, as was his custom when some grave problem tried him;

then he lay with his face in his hands, as he was wont to do when the solution seemed almost hopeless.

"Mentally, emotionally, physically; these bound the horizon of the possibilities." He was arguing with himself. "The second must be eliminated. That is a province which I have no right to enter. The first is too abstruse; I have not now the knowledge of the conditions that would enable me to work intelligently. Let that be laid aside, at least for the present.

"But the last possibility, 'physically'?

"Surgical skill has admitted its powerlessness. I cannot change that condition. To supplement materially: that alone is left. But how?"

Presently he arose, his countenance showing his sense of relief—at least of his hope of a solution—and he rang the bell. Promptly the maid would have answered the call, but a woman anticipated her, herself answering the summons.

"You called me."

"I rang."

"But you called me."

There was something triumphant, yet deferential, in the tone; something exultant in the pose and manner of the woman, as she stood

at the library threshold, repeating her answer to his call.

But let us see who this woman is who awaits his invitation to enter.

Not wife, not daughter. For there was an archness and an expression half pleading, half winning, to which assured position makes a woman superior—or makes her indifferent to please in little things—as you prefer.

IX

"WANTED.—The daughter of an army officer desires a position as housekeeper. Has had experience in her own home. Would prefer a location other than in central England. Address," etc., etc.

NATURALLY, the last sentence of the advertisement attracted attention, and the Man gave it careful study. Pride as its motive he quickly eliminated, for if merely loss of income had compelled her to leave her home the entire wording would have been different. It was evident that she wished to remove herself from painful associations, which financial losses alone would not have made repugnant. Between the lines he read a sense of shame which impelled her to seek a position among strangers. But because the lines were there, he was sure that

the shame was a reflected one—not her own. He read, too, a consideration for others; an unwillingness to invite replies which she would not wish to consider.

He wrote briefly, stating his position, and that entire responsibility and an independent authority would be given to any one who would be placed at the head of his household. To this there came the answer :—

"Dear Sir,—I thank you so much for your reply. I like it—more than any reply I have received. I dreaded taking this means of supporting myself, because I feared I should be subject to another woman's whims. I am already building castles in the air and wondering what all will be like, if you will be so good as to give me the position. And if I am at all impatient, it is because I must consider other replies, which I frankly tell you are not so welcome as yours. Let me tell you at once—and have the shameful story over—why I must support myself and why I wish to leave old associations.

"My husband was recently committed to prison, for 'irregularities' in his accounts. He was head bookkeeper in a bank here. Can I send you any references? Please command me if you wish me to tell you anything more

about myself. I will be only too glad to respond.—Most respectfully yours,

"Edith Adams Marriner."

And thus the Man's analysis ran: "Either this is a somewhat impulsive young woman—perhaps younger than Mrs Grundy would permit me to take into my household, if I and Mrs Grundy had mutual friends, whose interest in me was shown in other ways than 'thou shalt not'—or else it's a good many years since she 'picked the shell,' and yet is trying to pass herself off as a spring chicken. She is very ingenuous and frank, or she is skilled in flattery. Fortunately there is no half-way ground, and the closing sentence of her advertisement tells me—by its inner meaning—more than all that she has written. So I will give her the benefit of the doubt; and I will hope that she is young and handsome, and will make an attractive piece of bric-à-brac, to put in this cabinet—my home. That the 'irregularities' were not in any degree her own fault, that she did not tempt her husband into extravagance, I am convinced—unless she is an old cat playing kitten — for conscious guilt would have exemplified '*qui s'excuse, s'accuse*'; and she would have told a pretty fairy tale of 'deceived into liberal home expenditures by his boasting

of successful speculations, which made her feel free to enjoy his seeming success.' So I will telegraph that I will come to-morrow."

His hand was on the call. "No, I will go unannounced; a woman of character and true refinement is never placed at a disadvantage by the unexpected."

He found the conditions practically as he had anticipated, in regard to the wife's innocence of any share in her husband's downfall. The husband had been tempted by his vanity —his intense personal vanity which made him oblivious to the suffering and shame that would fall on his wife. The bank had among its prominent patrons a coterie of good fellows, who never neglected business for pleasure—if they were liable to be caught at it. And though "a good workman is known by his chips," the "chips" to which they devoted a large portion of their nights, represented the debris of energies that were too much wasted to permit competing successfully in business with capacities that were unimpaired. So they must have accommodation at the bank, and more than their "limit" would allow.

Very much flattered was the struggling bookkeeper when these prominent men became so friendly to him, offering him an opportunity to

add to his income, by devoting his evenings to the books and accounts of the club where they met every night. Perhaps it was through the manipulation of these men that complaint was made that this income passed to one who was not a member of the club, and so he was induced to use part of his new income in the payment of his dues—his entry fee generously paid by his friends. It was so easy to cajole him into a "quiet game," now that the club rules permitted him to play. It was just as easy to let him win, and still easier to flatter his vanity by admiring his skill and coolness. And then, when the time was ripe, the play was made heavy and he lost, and lost again, then won, till at last he lost his head—and half a year's income. Pity he had not then some friend to go to, who would have shown to him the pitfall which his false friends were digging under his feet. But his captors did not demand any money; his note would suffice, and "your old luck will come back." And so it did; and then went away faster than it came — and farther. Then there was a birthday dinner given, and, when the wine had made him ripe for his fall, the generous hosts gave him back his notes and drew from him the promise to give them large accommodation at the bank, substituting notes which they knew to be value-

less for the bank's cash, and to falsify his books to cover his deception.

He saved them from business failure. He wrecked himself. It was the old story. A sudden sharp illness; a new man at the books. A call at his house by the cashier of the bank. A confession of that which was self-evident.

But his tempters were prompt in their offers of help. They secured the best legal counsel, who in a fatherly way convinced him that to plead guilty would lighten his sentence; that not to implicate the influential men whom he had "accommodated" would command their influence to secure a speedy pardon, and assure their aid to put him on his feet again when his short term was over, they meanwhile caring for his wife. So the prison walls closed on him, the weak victim, while his tempters were astounded, and with the gravity of hypocrisy, regretted that so promising a young man should wreck his prospects.

Through it all his wife uttered no word of reproach. His "honour" prevented him from telling her how he had disposed of his thefts. So well had the able counsel done his work.

He was the man to whom she had given herself, both body and soul, in her first love. So she could not hate him.

He was silent when she asked him where the

money had gone. So she could not pity him.

She had only one thought—to find some place where everyone did not regard her with either pity or contempt.

Yes, she was young; and if not beautiful, no man need fear, when he had friends to entertain, that she would not lend grace to the head of the table.

While waiting for her to respond to his announcement — and he carefully noted the minutes that she required to make herself presentable—he hastily examined the photographs in the room till he found the face for which he had been seeking. Just a trace of a smile played about his lips as he regarded the portrait. "Weak, vain, selfish; not the selfishness of a mean nature, but of one who had been petted and had grown to be thoughtless of others. No woman who could admire true nobility of character could love such a man. Let us hope"—he said to himself—"that she was only a girl when she married; maybe it was for the interest of others to exhibit him to her in a too-flattering light. We will see."

The Man had barely ended his analysis and inferences when the door of the room opened.

He was just a little flattered by the eager expectancy which lightened her face. Truly she had been "building castles in the air," for she came forward with hand extended, as if she were meeting an old friend.

"It is a pleasant surprise. But wasn't I worth just a little word that I might have the pleasure of looking forward to your call? You can't understand what a pleasure it is to see a new face; a face which hasn't followed me for weeks, always showing consciousness of my misfortune. I hope that you never knew what it is to have the fault of someone else to bear."

The Man drew a little breath as if hit unexpectedly. "*Arcades ambo*," he said to himself. "We have both tasted the same cup."

"Do you believe in presentiments?" she continued, "or inspirations, or angel's whispers, or call them what you will? Well, when your letter came my heart seemed to leap into my throat before I opened it. I felt that it held my fate."

She had turned impulsively, and as she looked him full in the face and saw his eyes intently regarding her, her voice wavered, and for a moment she was silent. Presently, in more measured sentences, her eyes holding a far-off look, she added, in self-reproachful tones:

"I fear that I have made a grave mistake. I cannot blame you if you have misunderstood me; if you have thought me bold and unwomanly."

But the frank naturalness of her impulses broke quickly through the constraint; and again looking fully and calmly into the face which was as free as her own from false sentiment, she added:

"I beg you to regard the oppressive burden of these weeks of worse than widowhood. Put yourself in my place—but without a man's resources; only the choice between pity or contempt in every face that you saw. And then you came. You gave me no time to compose myself. I came to you at once. My heart was full of hope. I had not time to think. I could only feel; only long that you were to take me away from my humiliation." Then she waited in suppressed anxiety for his answer.

"You asked me," he said, "if I believed in presentiments. Yes and no. I think there was never a woman who cared for my welfare but startled me with a strange, though imperfect, insight into my actions. They were impressions which could not have come by mortal knowledge. Let me tell you the most striking.

"I was trying to find who was the writer of a letter that was evidence of a crime. I had inadvertently taken a car that was dropped at a little city, so I must remain there for the next train to the place where I thought it probable that the author of the letter lived.

"To beguile the time, I took some letters which had been given to me, and began to compare them with the incriminating letter. I was doing it idly almost; for there seemed no possible motive for such a deed on the part of the woman who had written them. Suddenly the unexpected happened, and I was forced to believe that this woman had written the incriminating letter.

"I immediately took a train for her home. She answered my ring at her door and greeted me with almost hysterical effusiveness. 'It is such a relief,' she said; 'I beg you to stay till I am composed. I have a horror of being alone; such a blow came to me to-day. I was in my sewing-room, when it seemed as if a great weight fell on my head and was crushing me to the floor, and I was filled with the horror of an unknown but terrible danger.' 'When did the blow fall?' I said. 'It was just four o'clock,' she replied. That was exactly the hour when the conviction of her guilt came to me. And yet she welcomed me who had

forged the bolt. So you see why I said 'Yes and no.'"

The story had accomplished its object. The tension was removed.

When a man who has little admiration for the sex in general, meets a woman whose character commands his respect in spite of her womanhood, he pays to her an earnest courtliness of admiration which cannot fail to impress through the loftiness of its sincerity. As the Man rose to leave, his whole being showed how far removed were his sentiments from the pity or contempt which had been her daily "bread of affliction."

"May I ask you one or two questions?" he said.

"Most assuredly; a whole catechism, if you will. I would be sorry—should you let me come under your roof—if there was a question you wished that you had asked, yet had given me no opportunity to answer."

"You were married quite young?"

"Oh, yes; I was only seventeen."

"And your wedding was a quiet one?"

"Very quiet. You see, my aunt, who brought me up, had daughters of her own, and she and they made me jealous; made me think that my Charlie was paying attention to some-

one else; and so the wedding was hurried, so that we could take our wedding trip in his holidays, and there wasn't time to have an elaborate wedding."

She was too much occupied with her own retrospect, too much absorbed in the bright hopes which he had aroused, to observe the half cynical smile which was the outward expression of his recognition of conditions which her replies revealed to him—unconscious as she seemed to be of what in her history she was thus unfolding to this accomplished student of evidence.

Then, handing her an envelope, he added: "I earnestly desire that you should avail yourself of the references which this contains. On the face of my card I write the names of those who believe in me and trust me; on its back, the names of enemies. You will probably have the good sense to accept neither good nor ill report without qualifying it by its opposite. The '*media via tutissima*' of our copy-books is as accurate as it is trite."

When he had gone a few feet from her door, he turned as if mistaken in his way. But there was a boy's roguishness in his heart as he caught her—by a sidelong glance from the tail of his eye as he repassed her house—peeping through the slats. Then the cynical look

came back to his face, as he said to himself: "Those two answers tell me all of the circumstances, all of the influences which made the child—not the woman—accept this weak man."

"Oh, my!" and her fingers went up and played an octave on the back of her head. "I caught him looking intently at my back hair. I hope it is all right. But what funny questions. What difference will it make to him whether his housekeeper had a quiet wedding or a swell one?"

"*Ex pede Herculem*," would have been his answer had she asked this question in his presence. By-and-by, when she has gained his confidence, and he uses her woman's eyes and wit to aid him in his studies, she will learn that from words, even more clearly than from more tangible things, there can be developed the spectrum analysis which will exhibit the true components of the ideas which the words reveal, or that they may be intended to conceal.

"But this fat envelope; what a lot of references it must contain! Does he expect me to write to all of these people? I think I had rather not open it, but take him for what I felt he was as soon as I saw him."

Her curiosity, however, triumphed over her

fear that maybe someone would write unfavourably in reply, and tell her that he was a bad lot; then she cautiously opened the envelope.

Nothing had been said definitely by either in regard to her salary, yet here was a sum equal to half of the yearly stipend that another had offered her.

It did not seem to her indelicate for him to place in her hands, or for her to receive, the crisp, clean notes. Her own purity of motive saw in it only an earnest of the wish which his eyes had told to hers; that he should be found worthy that she should come under his roof. The delicacy with which he expressed the hope that she would assume the charge of his household was as courteous as if welcoming an honoured guest, and made her wish to burn the list of references—at least to write only to those who believed in him and trusted him. With consummate tact implying that perhaps there was a bit of selfishness in his hope that against the dark background of her sorrow, it might be vouchsafed to him to develop, in the home he knew she would adorn and brighten, such a picture that the old darkness would be only a fading memory: telling her that it would grieve him if she came oppressed by the memory of obligations which the suddenness of the blow had made her unable to discharge;

obligations perhaps to those who would suffer —or would speak ill of her, if payment was not made. This letter she laid away among the few jewels which were left to her.

She wouldn't have been a real, warm-hearted, impulsive woman if she hadn't curled up and had a good cry ; then got just a little hysterical ; quickly recovering, however, for she must pay regard to the references. But she wrote to just as few as propriety would permit, oscillating between fear and perfect trust, as influences came from without or were from her own heart, while the hours dragged by so slowly, till the replies came.

X

Now that the step was irrevocably taken, now that in only half an hour more the train would stop at the station from which she would be taken to his home, there came an irrepressible longing to return.

She felt some influence, which seemed wholly outside of herself, swaying her impulses. She remembered vividly—too vividly for her present peace of mind—the tenderness of the parting with old acquaintances.

So long as she expected to remain at home they were only formally cordial. But when

they found that she was really to leave; when they knew that she would not continue to be a social incubus; no longer would be one whose presence was to be apologized for, the sense of relief may have deceived even themselves into a friendly interest, that made natural the warm expressions of regret at parting. The profuse wishes that she might find happiness in her new position, the emphatic approvals, to her face, of the step that she was taking, had the impress of sincerity; though behind her back each Pharisee among them held up her hands in thankfulness that she herself was not making her home, alone, with a man who was "so well preserved." A contrasting phrase which women are fond of using—when they suspect that their own youth is showing them its heels.

And worse than this: more serious than the deceptive recollecting of the few bright closing hours of the life which she had left behind—the strange forgetfulness of the fear of ostracism that had made every meeting with old friends a source of anticipation of humiliation—she began to dread the meeting with the man whose happiness she had longed to have in her keeping; the hope of winning whose approval had brought to her such buoyancy that her own joyousness made the more indifferent farewells seem considerate—even kind.

"In his power; in his power," the railway wheels seemed to ring out continuously and mockingly, and presently she would have worked herself up into a most pronounced case of "nerves"—which would have impelled her to do something absurd, so morbid was she becoming in her dread of meeting him—had not the train soon reached the station which was at the end of her journey.

Waiting on the platform till the bustle of arrival and departure was over, she was making her way toward the luggage truck, when she heard her name called. Turning, she saw two extended hands and a countenance which had the exquisite tenderness which only sorrow can mould the features to. The face was set in rippling, iron-grey hair, and the motherly gentleness of expression instantly won the confidence of the distraught woman.

"Warmest welcome I bring to you." The voice was as earnest as it was tender. "Our dear friend is absent, but he has sent me to find you. His man will take all the care of your luggage, if you will be so good as to point it out. Then dismiss all anxiety and let me care for you."

Strange perversity of womankind. The woman so cordially welcomed ought to have shown profound gratitude for the thoughtful-

ness. She ought to have given a sigh of relief that the Man was conveniently out of the way, for twenty-four hours at least. But she did no such thing. She only answered: "He is absent!" and relapsed into a quiet nursing of her sense of neglect, because he had timed her arrival on a day when he would be away from home. By-and-by, when she had learned him better, she recognized that it was a delicate thoughtfulness which substituted the motherly welcome. But fortunately her curiosity came to the rescue of her good manners—the lapse in which had only amused her hostess—and she was quite her natural self again by the time the two women had entered the carriage which was waiting for them.

No distinguished visitor could have been received with more consideration. The guest-chamber waited for her, daintily arranged and fragrant with flowers.

As she looked at herself in the cheval glass, she said to her reflection: "Well, you were a fool and no mistake; and I am ashamed of you; and if you had any sense of decency you would be ashamed of yourself. Go right down-stairs and tell that dear angel without wings that you were a fool and deserved to be punished for the bad manners which you showed at the railway station." And she did so;

putting her arm around the gentle woman's neck and kissing her impulsively as she made her confession.

Everywhere she saw, and delighted in, the evidences of his good taste. "Guest I am to-night in this lovely home," she said to herself exultantly, "and its mistress to-morrow and many to-morrows, and maybe on and on till—" She stopped and her face grew grave—as many a time thereafter the shadows fell on it, and fell more darkly as the time approached when she must cease to be free; because freedom would come to "him." That was all the designation she ever gave in her heart when she thought of the author of her sorrow.

But the call to tea happily came, breaking in upon her gloomy forebodings. Her hostess—who had promptly explained that she had come only to teach a little of the tastes of the master—placed herself at the tea-tray. As deftly as tastefully she made the function a graceful offering up of incense to the new priestess of the lares and penates of the household; and made it a dignified induction to her new authority, with an impressment of deference which assured the respect of those over whom the honoured guest was to have authority.

Then memory went back and labelled as only

an ugly dream the wild vagaries which had oppressed her at her journey's close.

XI

"Now, my dear child, sit right down by my side on this comfortable sofa, and look into this blazing wood-fire, and build your castles in Spain while I tell you about this man." She hesitated a moment, and then added slowly and piquantly, "whom you love."

"I! I love! What do you mean?"

"You told me so. You put your arms around my neck, and confessed that you had told me so."

"I did no such thing. I confessed that I had been discourteous to you; that was all I said."

"And you were discourteous—because! And now, dear, I am asking no confession; only giving you a little discipline for your own good; teaching you to be less impulsive, though I would not have you less natural and sincere. I believe that you will make our friend's home ever so much brighter and happier. But I must beg you to remember that there are other eyes just as observant as mine, though not coupled with lips so discreet,

or with hearts so loyal to him and to you, too; for ingrate I would be were I to forget how he once prevented a great sorrow from falling on me and mine.

"If I were to describe him in one word, I would say 'chivalrous.' Had I a daughter who could have filled the place you have taken, I would place her here, gladly. Hard and unrelenting he is to his enemies; and they are those whose evil deeds or heartless acts his firm hand has repressed or punished. The soul of loyalty to his friends, or to any cause which he espouses, it may be that he is a shade too reckless as to consequences—but never unjust—to win success: for he is a stranger to fear.

"Himself untiring, giving his best, he expects faithfulness: yet exacting less from others than he does from himself: and he is considerate. Frank, where frankness is due, yet by nature secretive, he has no patience for curiosity, and will not brook it. He regards it as among the grossest of insults.

"His enemies will tell you that he is not a saint; but I am sure that no man or woman ever left him with less of purity than he found them possessed of; while more than one despairing soul has taken hope and courage, and has had the firmness to continue in the better way which his kindliness prompted him to

provide. And they were steadfast in that way, because they knew that his strength would supplement their weakness, and that they could regard him as a faithful protector. Can I tell you anything more?"

"Yes; ever so much. How can I make him happy?"

"Oh, now! Did ever a woman really wish to make anyone happy, and her womanly instincts not show her the way—if she is faithful to them? But this single suggestion will perhaps be inclusive of much. Let him see that you wish to make home restful. The rest of quiet, if he is oppressed with thought; the rest of your real buoyancy, if he is only fatigued. And above all, let him feel that you do not expect him to be always entertaining." So the evening passed.

The sensations that come to us on our awakening on the first morning of a new arranging of our lives, have decidedly the flavour of our having become someone else. Out of these confused sensations the new mistress of the house was pleasantly called, by the beauty and perfume of the flowers which he had so thoughtfully provided, and which she had placed by the side of her pillow.

The first day was full of interest, in tactfully taking the measure of the servants. She re-

membered, too, the advice of the evening before: to make a division of duties to each, clearly naming those that she reserved for herself; and to do this promptly, before a degree of familiarity had made her authority less unquestioned.

Night was falling, and she felt a sense of exhilaration as she anticipated welcoming him.

"Home at last, and at last a home to look forward to returning to." He came in with a breezy, eager way, like a school-boy just returned for the holidays. He did not wait to remove his top-coat, but sought her out at once and extended his hand with a sincere cordiality which made her at ease. "I'm hungry as a bear; and after dinner you must tell me all of the bad things that our friend said about me, so that I can immediately begin turning over a new leaf—any number of new leaves."

She knew what he meant. "Well, she was just lovely, and so cordial, and gave me such good advice that I am afraid I should have believed her if she had said bad things about you. But dinner is ready and you must go at once and get ready, for you men will not forgive a cold dinner—even if the fault is yours."

She listened till the sound of his steps ended

at his own room. "He never had a daughter. He shall know what a daughter's love is, if I have power to bring it to him."

As they were ready to part for the night he led the way to his library and opened the safe.

"Here are duplicate keys for you. This drawer is yours. From it make all disbursements for the household—and deal with yourself as equitably as you would deal with me, if conditions were reversed. I shall ask no accounting. Good night." He took her hand in both of his for a moment; then left the room too abruptly for any thanks.

The tears came into her eyes as she recalled his expression of confidence—his delicate avoidance of anything that would be like making terms with a servant. But she was too happy for tears, even of gratitude, to be lasting; and tossing the keys in the air with a child's glee she said, "There's just one man in this world; and if I don't make him the happiest man that ever lived in it, then—may I lose these keys, and to another woman at that."

As the months passed by, her recognition of his strength grew apace; and she grew into restfulness in it. "Maybe there will be no ending; whatever he attempts he accomplishes. I will trust." It was trust only; for she did

not dare—did not care to consider how. She had learned to rest.

. . . . . .

Was it something akin to weariness with "Aristides the Just" which at last brought to this placid home life a disturbing influence? Only a woman's love of power. No wish to hold his shorn locks in her lap. Only the desire to command his admiration for her womanhood. Simply to dominate his calm, strong self-possession, and sway it in yielding recognition of her charms.

These were the thoughts that prompted her to burst upon him in all the loveliness that she could command. "Admire me; tell me I am beautiful." This was what the snowy, heaving, "half concealed, half revealed" bosom and the graceful outstretched arms were pleading for. Just an hour of a woman's triumphant power, won through his love of the beautiful, was all that she asked, as she stood before him in the unconscious temptation of her charms.

Oh, Temptation, subtlest when you come and tell us that we are strong, and that we can safely harbour you; bidding us, the while, show to ourselves and to the world that we can treat you as a plaything.

And she did win his admiration. Never could he forget how radiant she was, standing

between the parted portières, that made effective setting of her loveliness. Never would she forget how she swayed him. He stood silent a moment.

"You are beautiful to-night," impressively, calm and low. Then a deep gasp, a quivering of the hands, their palms turned outward as if pleading for possession. It was over in a moment. The tempter had passed; for before the shadow came over his face, before the outstretched arms fell passively, before he had uttered the words that filled her with shame for many a day, his good angel had flashed out from memory her warnings. He saw faces of men who had "renewed their youth" and came to him haggard and appalled at the power—and its brutal use—that their temptresses held and exerted; beseeching him to interpose his iron hand and deliver them. And clearer, perhaps because nearer, the face of one—she seemed to his ripe manhood hardly more than a child—who had come to him, the bitterness of death swallowed up in the terror of the shame she would bring to her home, and in the horror of the curse in her motherhood that she would inflict on the little life to be. Again there came to him, sounding like the funeral knell of hope, the stony, hard appeal of her hopelessness—all the more pathetic that its

calmness was the icy strength of a frozen heart: "I have engaged a position as companion to a lady going abroad. It will be easy to reach too far over the stern to recover my hat. The great deep ocean will never give up my ugly secret. My belt of shot will save me from rescue. I don't feel quite prepared to die; but I have no choice—unless you can save me. Will you?"

"Three months' income for a life—two of them"; this to himself; and to the girl he said only, "I will."

"Beautiful! How your husband would admire you!" Had the hands that had fallen that moment to his side been raised and struck her in the face, she would not have recoiled more from the blow. Her face grew almost ashen from the shock, as she clutched the portières for support, hiding her horror in their folds. Then suddenly she relaxed her grasp, gave him one look that was beseeching and reproachful, and fled to her room.

It was a cruel kindness. Perhaps the surgeon's knife need not have cut quite so deeply, but it was an emergency case; there was no time to calculate closely.

She almost tore her lovely costume to shreds in her bitter haste to put it away from her.

She had planned with such care to make herself beautiful in his eyes; his only. It had been such a joy in its conception and execution. So many times she had rearranged it. It must be perfect, for it was for him; and now it lay before her, as thorough a wreck as was the joy she had tasted for a moment. Through that long night she lay sleepless, bitterly moaning, till too exhausted to think, almost to feel.

"The wife of a thief. Bound 'to love, honour and obey till death us do part.' Shut out from human love, how can I believe even that God loves me? Yes, 'till death us do part'; not his death, but mine. 'Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.' He, the only man I ever met that was worth living for, he struck me with those cruel words. Did he think that I am only a child? Did he think that I hadn't power enough to command myself, if those strong arms that longed for me had really taken me? But he did love me; just one little minute he loved me, and it cost him, oh, such an effort! I'm glad it cost him such a struggle. I can forgive him for the sake of that inward battle where he had to strike me to end this fight with himself."

And so, between the brief flashes of the rays of that one moment of triumph, and the dark, pervading clouds of the humiliation which was

not of her own doing, the weary night passed on.

And do you suppose he thought that she was "only a child"? Well, that treacherous "little god without breeches," the roguish child, Eros, nestles so innocently, and you watch his baby face in your bosom; and, lo, he has changed before you know it; and he has grown to Amor, and he takes you in his strong arms, bearing you whither he listeth.

The thickest pall of sorrow must lose a degree of its oppression when the exhilarating rays of the rising sun fall upon it: the sombre night is at last ended.

She wondered why he left the house so early.

Presently he returned and she heard him come softly to her door, and as she listened there came a sound like a faint rap, but too soft to have awakened the lightest sleeper; then she heard him quietly returning to his library.

Curiosity suggested to Sorrow that it step aside a moment till the cause of that sound had been investigated. Curiosity opened the door a little and in fell a box of flowers—a whole armful of them. And with them such a tender letter. The blame was wholly his. He had been selfishly inconsiderate. Could she ever

forgive him? He had been so happy in his home; she so buoyant, or so considerately unobtrusive, as his mood or need required, that he had forgotten the long, uneventful days filled with cares that were only repetitions of each other. He wondered that the dreary monotony had not made her a candidate for a strait-jacket. He would send her off on a holiday, hating Mrs Grundy all the while that he could not go with her, that he might see all the bright things through her eyes. She must drive out every pleasant day; the horses needed the exercise. She must "go out" more. And he closed with more self-reproach, begging her to wear to breakfast a few sprays of his favourite lily of the valley in token of her forgiveness.

This she did, and entered the breakfast-room, very busy in arranging another bunch, that she might go straight to him and fasten it in his button-hole, thus sparing herself the embarrassment of looking so high as his face in the morning greeting, while he read aloud, with apparent intense interest, an item from the morning paper. She knew the article was so foreign to his real interest, that the ludicrousness of his awkward attempt to relieve the embarrassment of the situation appealed irresistibly to her appreciation of the funny. She burst into such shouts of laughter that he began

to edge away towards his hat and top-coat, fearing a display of hysterics would follow, but feeling even that would not be too high a price for escaping the dreaded awkwardness of their meeting.

XII

"How are the mighty fallen." Can it be that this is the same man who rebuked me so pitilessly because I came to him and sought his admiration? Was it not enough to have come behind my chair and whisper to me to meet him at ten o'clock to-night in his library—yet in not so low a tone but that the handsome maid heard him and looked her triumph over me? Was not this enough, without his asking me to give him the photograph of that pretty maid—and all this in his own house?" Her idol was only a man after all; he had fallen from his pedestal, and she did not know whether most to pity him or to despise him.

But she obeyed him, and was chagrined beyond measure that the contempt she felt—and emphatically expressed in her manner—was apparently unobserved by him, though she noticed his evident satisfaction as she gave him the girl's picture.

"Please send Osborn to me when I am alone in the library. I almost forgot to thank you for the picture." He certainly was very much absorbed in it.

As Osborn entered he said:

"You told me that you wished to go to your club to-night."

"Yes, I would like to go; but if I can be of service to you, I will gladly give it up."

"So far from your staying away for me, I should be sorry if you did not go. You said that there would be a little supper at your club. At the proper time take this envelope from your pocket, saying that it was received from a friend, and you don't know what is in it. Open it and pass its contents around for comments. Tell me what you learn; but don't come to me till morning."

. . . . . .

"Let me have a game of chess with you."

She saw that the pieces were set, and that the Man was seated at the table, as she entered the library at the hour he had named. He welcomed her without looking up. It was so unlike his former self.

"I hope to show you some new moves to-night," he added. The play had lasted perhaps twenty minutes, and she was sure that she

held the advantage, when he almost hissed "Checkmate."

"But you needn't strike the table so hard and nearly upset the pieces," she said.

He made no answer, softly rising; and as he looked into her strained face he was glad that the test was over. Noiselessly approaching the door, he quickly opened it.

"What are you here for?" The girl stood paralyzed, but stammered out in reply:

"I thought you wished me to wait up till Osborn came in."

"Then sit there." He pointed to the place where—in the now unlighted hall—a chair usually stood, and quickly closed the door. As the girl came to the floor with a heavy fall, he pointed laughingly to the hall chair, now within the library.

"And the last move of the game. Listen! I was sure that the hard floor would astonish her into the 'flight that is confession.'"

The girl had picked herself up, groped her way through the dark hall, and was rushing to her room, her noisy steps impelled by anger and chagrin.

"The 'last move?'" The woman said, "Yes, truly; yet I feel that the last move should be my going down on my knees, for my distrust of you. For all the while that I doubted you, you

were arranging a punishment for her, because you saw that she was insulting me by her base suspicions."

And he replied: "Your heart is kneeling and pleading so charmingly that I can ask for nothing more."

She looked up laughingly, as she put out both hands and said: "Good night; and if you catch me again, base deceiver, it will be I that will have 'the last move,' I will find a way to checkmate you."

"You have had your lesson?" he asked.

"Lesson? a whole curriculum; graduated and entitled to a diploma."

"I hope that you have recovered from your fall of last night." There was nothing mocking in the Man's tones; they were very business-like in their greeting, as the girl entered the library on the following morning.

"I leave your house to-day," the girl replied with bravado.

"And you will go to—?" He stopped, and was drawing from his pocket her photograph.

"I don't know that it is any of your business where I will go." This even more defiantly.

As she spoke, he was coming close to her, and placed her picture in her hands. Osborn

had let it run the gauntlet of the club, and it bore the marks of the encounter. She glanced down at it and saw an address at the bottom that had not been there the day before. In an instant the bravado left her and she stood aghast. She hid her face in her hands.

"Oh, my God, will my shame follow me wherever I go? I meant to reform, I—"

"Stop. Do not insult that almost sacred sentiment with such a lie. You stood before my door last night, a self-confessed black-mailer. I saw, almost as soon as you came under my roof, your base desire to entrap us, and I knew that if I gave you the right kind of rope you would hang yourself—and you did."

"Don't; don't call me by the awful name you just named me. I am not so bad as that. I would not have taken money from you. Had anyone else attacked your characters I would have defended you. But I saw that she admired you, and—you know the school, rather I hope you don't know it, in which I have been taught; where we learn that all men are base and that all women are weak. You were, both of you, kind to me, and that very kindness made me long to be on equal terms with you both.

"Consider what kind of a home I had—no,

not home, hutch. Rabbits know as much of what home means as I did. My mother married my father because he was a handsome animal, and so he made her a beast of burden. There I learned every foul word that a man can use to a woman. Decency was a stranger there. Why shouldn't I think everyone was as bad as he taught me?"

If to the Man's heart there came a degree of pity, it was a pity that was not brightened by hope.

"Come." It was request rather than command which his voice expressed as he led the way to the mirror. "Look at the picture, as if it was that of one who is a stranger to us. Those large, roving eyes; the full, ripe lips; the development of the lower face; all these tell men that Nature has won half the battle for them; and so they will come again and again to the contest, where your past has so little to offer in aid of your weak impulse to do right."

"But I pray you to give me one more opportunity to save myself."

"No; not here at least. Here there would be no incentive to follow in the better way.

"However, I will send you to a lovely old lady, who will accept my statement that you came out of a home that had only evil influ-

ences, and she will be kind to you, and will ask no further questions.

"I will write to her and will also telegraph her, so that by no chance will you come unannounced. If you really desire to remain under good influences you will have the opportunity to save yourself from yourself."

"I will show you that I value your kindness," she said.

More in sorrow than in a spirit of cynicism the Man continued: "You will make her lonely home very bright, till the novelty of the new position is past. Then—since you have no resources within yourself—you will be weary of the uneventful life: you will be careless in your duties: and when you are reproved you will be petulant. This will grow as your *ennui* increases.

"Then all that was dreary and wearisome and repugnant in your stained life will be forgotten, and you will remember only the brighter side—and, oh how winningly the devil will show that to your weariness of goodness. You will go out only to take a little look into the dark waters, just out of curiosity, and your feet will slip on the slimy bank, and you will be engulfed.

"It is not a pleasant picture for me to draw—for you to see yourself portrayed in. But I

hope for nothing better. Yet none the less will I welcome your drawing a lovelier one—in tones that will be permanent. Your letters can continue to come here. No one need know where you are. I will provide amply for your journey. You will do well to go to-day."

And when she had gone he mused: "Is it worth all the effort—not mine, but of that pure soul to whom I am sending her? 'Handsome animal,' she said of her father, and that is the quality which he has bequeathed to her. No moral impulse, no buttressing of purer motive by the memory of home and loved ones. False love, false friendships are most likely to come to her in her loneliness: and she has lost—rather never acquired in the 'hutch' she was reared in—the delicacy that would warn her against such insidious influences. Yet I am glad that she recoiled so sharply; glad that there was so much of good in her that she rebelled against the ugly charge I made when she entered here.

"But will the good impulse outlast the refinement which God gives to early womanhood? Probably not. And later, kind and ignorant souls, bent on doing good, and in their supreme ignorance seeing all hearts as free from guile as their own, will come to her and such as she: will mistake the weariness with the slavery, the chagrin of neglect to the fading charms, for

sincere repentance: will clothe the seeming penitents with the garb of respectability, giving them letters of marque to go out and invade homes, and work the silent injury which their ripened judgment tells them can be effected safely—because the victims will never dare to complain.

"Better, far better, that such become the sodden victim of alcoholism: and so, content in stupor, the world will be spared the ravages of that most dangerous member of society—a reformed woman.

"But where is the primal wrong of her environment—for she is a victim of conditions into which she was born? Back of her coarse father, back of the weak, soulless mother, presumably we must look.

"Will a better civilization, a truer Christianity, protect childhood from ante-natal curse?"

XIII

But all this time we have left the woman standing triumphantly at the threshold of the library.

Triumphant her womanhood had the right to be, since its "sixth sense" had penetrated his

consciousness and had read there that he wished her to come to him.

"Yes, you are right." Laughingly he yielded; yet with a sort of awe, as he regarded that strange power which he knew he could not himself command.

"I did want you. Now take this chair, which I permit no one else to use—and so you are always *quasi* present, though if you often exercise such intrusive power as you have been guilty of just now, it will be banished, as something eerie; something through which you have established a weird power.

"Will you find out for me, as early as you can, who is the regular physician in the family of the Rev. James Underwood?"

"I think that I can tell you now; at least I have twice seen the carriage of old Doctor Matthews at the clergyman's door."

"My dear old friend," the Man replied, as his face lighted up with satisfaction, and then became thoughtful in reminiscence.

"Now, please remain seated, and do not feel that I am dismissing you abruptly, if I go out to enter on some work which I have in hand."

She obeyed him, but only till she heard the outer door close: then she was at her old trick of watching, through the blinds, his soldierly bearing and buoyant step. But he never caught

her peeping again, as he had detected her after their first meeting. He had rallied her so provokingly on her maladroitness that she did not permit him to have another opportunity to turn the laugh on her.

"What use can such a picture of health and vigour have for an old doctor? But welcome, most hearty welcome, I give you: come right into my consulting-room."

"You are right," the Man replied: "not even to a 'mind diseased' can I ask you to minister. Yet to a very puzzled mind perhaps you can afford relief. I wish to ask you a few questions: yet if I attempt to exceed the bounds of professional secrecy, do not hesitate to ignore my inquiries."

"Oh, I have no fear of your transcending. I can conceive of no question you may desire to ask to which I could not give unreserved answer."

"Thanks for the assurance; you and I need have no prologues. So I will ask you to tell me about the oldest daughter of the Rev. James Underwood. You have been his family physician for a long time?"

"For nearly twenty years; ever since he came here."

"Then you can tell me of her lameness. Is

there any anchylosis of the knee; any wasting of the muscles below the knee?"

"None whatever, I can assure you."

"And is the articulation at the hip reasonably free?"

"Reasonably so. Indeed, except for the shortening of the limb, and some stiffness, her limb is as good as anyone's."

"I am glad of this assurance; you have relieved my anxiety," the Man replied.

"Not one-half so much as you once took the weight off my heart when shame and sorrow were impending to a family which was dear to me." The fighting face came and settled like a mask on the Man's countenance, as he remembered the details of the incident which the doctor had recalled.

In parting, the old doctor was fairly overflowing with happiness. It was all clear to him. He honoured and trusted the Man, and assured him how sincerely he wished him every success in his efforts.

He loved the child—all the more because he had been powerless to prevent her deformity. To be sure there was marked discrepancy in their ages, but seventy regards a man of fifty years as comparatively young—in defence of its own growing infirmities.

In the Man's perfect vigour, in his power to

provide a charming home for the penniless, crippled girl, he felt that the advantage was thoroughly on her side. He would do all that he could to advance his friend's interest. Later, when he sang his friend's praises in her home, he was grieved to find that his tribute was received so coolly.

XIV

"Fair warning, Sir Knight! If you crush the tiniest of my beloved flowers, you must dismount and on bended knee sue for forgiveness."

The Man knew that to carry out his plan he must have a woman's aid; a woman who was able to keep a secret. He had chosen this woman as his ally, because she would not make a confidant of the husband whom she had estranged years ago; and the Man felt confident that his plan would not be generally disclosed, because, in a sympathy the husband had not sought, his friends, especially those of the distaff sex, had made her position almost isolated.

It was a theory of the Man that it is unsafe to trust a woman who is liable to fall in love with her husband. He felt sure that of such peril to his confidence there was no danger here.

Reared in an atmosphere of selfishness, herself the fruit of a marriage which had been established for the sake of personal advantage —on either side—the woman whom the Man had taken as his ally had accepted the hand of the handsome young physician, just as she would have acquired any other treasure which the world had appraised as valuable.

Her high vitality, which bore with it a splendid flow of spirits, at first had made unnoticeable her vacuity of noble sentiment. In the husband's own devotion he was not critical of her lack of tenderness.

But at length that love of power which lies sleeping in all of us, till opportunity arouses it, overcame whatever degree of tender consideration she may have felt for him. It was a keen, unholy pleasure that filled her soul as she saw him turn pale, as if the blood had gone back to his heart, while an appeal for pity pleaded in his eyes when she first laid bare her selfishness, and displayed the emptiness of her heart.

It is not easy to give up an ideal: not readily does a noble character release itself from its pledge.

Had she been as skilled as she was pitiless in marital torture, she would have healed the wound and nursed the stricken love back to life, impelled by self-interest and by the pleasant

anticipation of again and again watching him quiver under her stinging words. But she was lavishly wasteful of her power; too engrossed with the joy of its exercise to observe that the blows were falling on nerves which were losing their susceptibility to pain.

At length—and before she had suspected how rapidly her resources were waning—she found herself bankrupt of power.

He had waited patiently, at first tenderly, hoping that it was only a passing impatience; and that the true woman whom he had believed he had married would assert herself, and that she would be a devoted wife when her better self had conquered a passing impulse.

At last he ceased to hope; and when she found that he met her attacks with cynical calmness, her chagrin impelled her to unbridled bitterness. This, and her, he regarded with amused indifference. She was drawing against "no funds." Her resources were exhausted. Then she came and stood over him, and was fast forgetting herself in her passion of anger—at herself—because she had squandered her power.

He rose and took her shoulders in a vice-like grasp. "Let this be the last time that you indulge in such an exhibition. If in future your language is other than respectful—other than you would use to a man for whom you

were only housekeeper—I will give a lease of this house to people who will enter it and remain here, and who will meet your violence with its equal if you try to remain. I will go to the —— Hotel. I shall provide rooms for you adjoining mine, but my man will see to it that you do not enter my apartments unless you are sent for. While you remain here you will exercise every care in the management of this house. If you fail to do this, I will establish a housekeeper here who will be sufficiently muscular to protect my rights—and her own. I trust that you will recognize that this house is large enough for each of us to move in his or her own orbit, and that these need not touch each other."

Loving his profession, his sincerity impelling him to loyalty to every obligation, he had always been devoted to duty. Now it was no longer only duty that commanded him. Absorbing activity in the relief of suffering was his "surcease of sorrow." The tenderness which another might have lavished on—at least divided with—all that home may include, he gave to those who suffered. No demands were too frequent, none wearisome, and more and more he grew to be "the beloved physician."

The poor found in him a considerate friend; he had no motive to acquire money.

Strange and blessed alchemy which transmutes sorrow into the soothing balm for others' pain.

Faithful to household duty she continued: yet not from fear; but because with his asserting of his masterful self-control she entertained a respect for him such as he had never before commanded. Then, again, cut off from most of her social enjoyments, her home became more important to her; and, most of all, her delight and pride were in the magnificent parterres through which the Man was guiding his horse, when the fair challenger sounded her warning. Truthfully he could compliment her on the charming picture which her face and figure made, the setting of the window draperies matching and heightening her attractiveness.

"I have come to ask you to lend me those handsome shoulders—fairest in all the country side—that over them I may do a kindly act; for alone I would be powerless. I would fail utterly if I were to come out into the open and show a man's presence. With your 'woman's wit' and your ingenuity I am sure of success."

Her face told him that the conditions were opportune; and it delighted him, as he unfolded his plan, that she was ready to co-operate with him.

XV

One week later: the same scene; the same pair of kindly plotters.

"Well, I am sure that you are eager to know all about how your plans have been executed."

And the Man replied: "I had no fears that they would miscarry; I had confidence in your skill and ingenuity."

"And it required both to induce the mother to allow her daughter to come to my house. I think it was through piquing the mother's curiosity that I succeeded.

"When I invited the girl to take a drive with me, she wondered why I insisted on her putting on one of my long skirts. My carriage was at the door and we drove to Milburn's, where I had sent your beautiful gift and my saddle, for I feared its girths were too old and weak. I had no thought of old lame Duncan, who was turning away from the curb, having set the new girths, just as I had helped the girl to the pavement.

"'Now go right up to him and put your arms around his neck and tell him you love him,' I said. But she shrank back to my side, and whispered:

"'Oh, I cannot. He is old and ugly, and besides, everyone would see me.'

"'Oh, you dear child; I don't mean old Duncan; I mean your own beautiful horse. He is yours, yours only; from his soft brown muzzle to the tip of his handsome tail.'

"She looked at me in wonder a moment, then threw aside her cane and went to him and wound her arms around his neck, kissing him and calling him all pet names.

"I explained to her why he was trying to find her pocket; and when he drew out the sugar which I had placed there she went wild with delight. It was evident, right then and there, that they would be the best of friends.

"'Oh, my; but isn't it a long way down to solid earth! He has grown two feet at least, since I left the ground for his back,' she said. It was evidently the first time that she had mounted a horse."

"But had she no fear?"

"Fear? How could she have fear? In 'the perfect love that casts out fear' she thought only of her newly-found joy.

"I drove by her side, out into the country. She would take no hints. I had to tell her plainly that we must return; that her horse had been out of work for some time, and she must not overwork him at first.

"I had assured myself, before we started, that her shortened limb had a firm grip on the pommel of the saddle. She will learn quickly. I seldom had occasion to correct her a second time."

"I can compliment you on your skill as a teacher. I met her yesterday. A duchess could not have been more haughty in her bearing when I complimented her on her good riding. The child's manner told me that her father does not regard that which passes in his study as a confidence to be respected; and for this I am most sorry, for his own sake."

The woman's face grew grave as she resumed: "But I must tell you of what followed and which moved me deeply.

"On our return she had dropped off the skirt which I had given to her, and as she placed her hand on her own — as if that act was the suggestion of the first link in a chain of recollections—her face grew strangely serious, then expressive of pain. Impulsively she came to me and knelt with her head on my lap. And then she confessed to me! Think of it; to me, who have never done one kindly act except it amused me! To me that pure child poured out her soul. She told me of what she called her awful sin.

"In childhood she had not recognized the

barring from the joys of young womanhood which her imperfect limb would effect. But of late she has grown to this recognition."

"I understand," the Man interposed. "In her father's religious philosophy there was no comfort for her but to believe that a loving Father had brought this darkening of her life to test her faith; it taught her that it was done arbitrarily, with full power to prevent it, if He had chosen; but it was 'part of His divine plan,' and so she must not murmur."

"You are right; and her whole soul had risen in rebellion.

"'I was growing to hate God,' the girl continued. 'I could have borne it if I could have considered only myself, could have regarded Him as I would regard anyone else who had permitted an injury to me. But, for my father's sake, I must appear to love Him. This life of hypocrisy was hardest of all. It made me hate God, because I had to wear a mask for father's sake. The time came when I must go to the communion service. I pleaded illness and so avoided it. But another communion service is close at hand. My heart was growing harder. I knew God would punish me—perhaps forever—if I partook of the communion, even though I did so to save my dear father from pain. And this made me

hate God all the more. I would not dare to take the sacred emblems. I could not grieve my blessed father by refusal.'

"The girl was speaking through sobs which the memory of the bitter struggles had produced. She was silent for a while—perhaps it was in prayer—and then she looked up, smiling through her tears, as she calmly and softly resumed:

"'But now, now it is all changed. God loves me. He does love me; that thought was filling my heart as I rode. And now I can love Him; and I will love Him, and it may be that the best way to show my love to Him is by enjoying His gift all that I can; keeping my heart full of gratitude to Him for the beautiful gift, His gift.

"'Next Saturday there is to be a tennis tournament at Beatrice Malcolmson's. She invited me so kindly, but every word was a pain to me. A nice easy-chair was to be arranged for me in the best place, and I was to watch the sport in which I could never take part. I intended to stay away if I could find an excuse. Their sport would be mockery of my weakness. There will be no excuses now. Now I shall go—but I will not go among them in helplessness, to be coddled in an easy-chair, for on the back of my darling I will sit. There I am the equal of any of them, for while he is

just as gentle as can be, I feel that I could sit tight if he was a bucking bronco.'

"Then her sweet face, which permits one to anticipate every emotion that she will give expression to, became self-reproachful. 'I have not confessed everything,' she said with penitent demureness; 'and I have learned a lesson. Never again will I believe evil of any one. I believed the evil that they told me of you. They told me you were hard and selfish; that you made your noble husband's life a miserable one; that you did not love him. I know that it is false; God would not have chosen you — you would not yourself have obeyed His command—to save me from my awful sin, if you had been the bad woman they told me that you were. I know that you are good and kind. I know that it is only those who envy you who have said such cruel words. I love you and trust you, and I will come every day to you and will not be in your way; I will take my work and sit in the stable with my darling.'

"'Smoother than oil, yet be they very swords,'" the woman quoted.

"Every word that she spoke of love and trust stirred my inmost spirit. I longed to throw off the mask that you had placed on me. I would have done so had I been free to act,

could I have done so without thwarting your plans, and so doing her a great injury. And then there came a gentler mood. Who knows but that it was her good angel that was calming and inspiring me? I longed to tell her the truth; to tell her that one who was really kind and unselfish, who loved to relieve distress, to deliver the oppressed, had given to her this new treasure. But that better spirit bade me be silent. As I looked into that trustful face a strange calm possessed me. It was as if an intelligence above and beyond myself was dominating my mind; as if a better, truer self —and more real than the self that I had known; that through all my life I had called myself— was telling my unworthy self that I was not my own; that I was not free to act as my impulse was swaying me. Told me that in the fabric of the child's new faith my unworthiness had been builded in, and that He who builded had chosen my unworthiness that He might glorify it through His abounding grace.

"In the sweet serenity of this new-found consciousness of a nobler self than ever I had longed for, I took the child in my arms and resting her head on my shoulder, drew her to my heart as I had never folded any one. Then I said: "My child, to each of us has come today a glorified illumination of our better selves;

with each heart beating close to the other let each make dedication of that better self, in quiet self-communion."

Then the woman was silent; her high resolve ennobling her face, which was turned to him with an expression of entreaty. Presently she resumed:

"I am not accustomed to asking favours; unaccustomed to seeking help. But it is not for my own sake that I ask your aid. Help me to be what this child believes me to be. I cannot live a lie to her. Yet it is my thought for her which makes me dread that I should be iconoclast, and myself cast down the image which you and I have permitted her to believe is worthy to repose faith in.

"I am sadly conscious that it is only an image of earth, earthy, yet you know that you are more guilty than I for the setting up of it."

Then, as the story of Pygmalion and Galatea was recalled, archly she said: "Can't you pray to Aphrodite—your enemies say that you pay homage to her—and beseech her to make this graven image become a real, true woman? I would ask no further parallel, for I am too good a friend of yours to permit you to follow Pygmalion's example, and to marry—even if she

were free—such 'a bad lot' as the graven image would be, if only Aphrodite vivified her."

"Trivial, insincere; the noble motive shown to be only an impulse."

Thanks, ingenuous reader, for your confession. For you have told us that you have never experienced the joy of rising to an exalted purpose; the very purity of motive inspiring fear that a less noble past may darken the lustre of the cause espoused.

You tell us, too, that in you is no sympathy with the sensitive recoiling of a new-born nobleness from any outward expression; and so you cannot accept her play of fancy as only the modest sheltering of the purer motive, till she is sure that it will meet a responsive sentiment.

Fortunately, he whom she addressed was a skilful student of expression, and so the lighter veiling of her language made the sincerity of her motive only the more apparent. So he said:

"But, really, I cannot permit you to take no credit to yourself for the peace which came to the child through the joy that you and I have been permitted to bring to her. Vividly and gratefully I shall always remember your willingness to help me in bringing that joy to her."

Almost as warmly as if she were defending

herself—so eagerly her better nature was protesting against any deception even through silence—the woman answered:

"And why shouldn't I have helped you? You complimented me so tactfully; you sat your horse like a centaur; you presented the plan with skilful appeal to my love of acting a part which would make my enemies admit that I had generous qualities—and you didn't suspect the presence of another ally which was aiding you. It was my contempt for her mother.

"She is a Pharisaical old cat; and I knew that I would enjoy sending the child home, singing my praises daily, to the mother who must endure them for the continuance of the happiness which I would be bringing to her daughter." This with a warmth which was intenser than mere retrospect would quicken to.

Back again to earth you have fallen, fair penitent. Icarus-like, your wings have failed you, as again, and "time and again," they will fail you. Not from a glowing warmth without will the lesion come, but relaxed by unguarded fires within, because—you are a daughter of Eve.

"You asked a little while ago that I help you to be really what the child believes you to be. With all my heart I will give you whatever aid I can bring to you."

At once he entered on the problem.

"Along the lines of least resistance; that is philosophical." Unconsciously he was thinking aloud.

"Oh, bother your philosophy and least resistance. I am a woman!"

If in her words there was anything of self-depreciation, because of her lack of power to philosophize, her bridling pride in her womanhood quickly entered its graceful and commanding protest against anything which seemed like an admission of conscious inferiority—because she was a woman.

"Between the lines" of her impatience, his sympathetic watchfulness read the noble eagerness to know—the almost fear that he could not find—the way she penitently sought to walk in. Then he said:

"A woman's home is her natural kingdom. There she best can command power if she is to effect an influence for good. Fortunate beyond most women are you in that your siege can be laid from without also.

"All know that your noble husband is devoted to the relief of suffering among the poor. Every devoted physician experiences keen sorrow that his best efforts are often fruitless, because his skill cannot be supplemented by careful nursing.

"I will have some kindly 'mother in Israel' find from him where he would welcome such intelligent nursing.

"Into such homes of poverty you will go. You will demand from those whom you aid that they give him no idea who is their benefactor. He will soon recognize the benefit of your assistance; then satisfaction in the better results of his attendance, may lead to a sincere interest in the woman who is aiding him.

"Good deeds cannot long be hidden; and when accident reveals them they will be all the more effective through sincere unostentation. When he discovers that the ministering angel is his wife you will have your opportunity. But let a calm self-respect wait on your penitence. For penitence is all the more impressive if it bends from an elevated pedestal of dignified self-respect. Tears influence only a weak man —permanently. A cringing self-abasement would never command your husband's respect. Sincere contrition will be all the more irresistible, if channelled in a dignified sense of the claims of your womanhood; if its deep, pure current is borne along the heights of consciousness of lofty and ennobled motive.

"Assiduously consider his comfort in his home, yet do not discover this to him. But do not relax your efforts—in either direction—

when they have accomplished their service to you. Let him and the world see that not for yourself alone did you enter on this new life."

Without delay she began her service to those who were suffering. Equally studious she became in adding to her husband's comfort. He appreciated the thoughtfulness and thanked the upper servant; who was too diplomatic to permit herself to lose, through needless explanations, the material expression of his appreciation.

Her splendid vitality was never overtaxed.

A little child of three years of age had won her love. She was never weary of listening to its struggles with elusive consonants and vowels. But the struggles grew weaker as the days went by, though its answering love was just as bright and strong.

At last the new toys ceased to amuse.

"I want only you, auntie dear. Hold me close, and sing to me soft and low. There, I'm so happy now in your strong arms."

But she must hear from the physician's own lips if the case was as hopeless as it seemed. When she heard his footsteps she hid herself in the wardrobe, the door ajar so that she could hear his decision.

"Dear heart, you are very weary, are you not?" she heard him say.

"Sometimes, but not when auntie holds me close to her bosom."

"And would you be very sorry if some time you were to fall asleep, and when you woke up you were well and strong and with the angels?"

"Not if I can take mamma and auntie and baby brother with me."

"Not with you, dear child, but they will come to you by-and-by; and when they come you will be waiting for them, and have everything ready for them."

"But can't I come back to comfort mamma and auntie and baby brother?"

"God grant that you can return; and, if you can, to me too; for I need such comfort, and I would gladly lay my head on your pillow and fall asleep with you, and we would take each other's hands and go through the pearly gates together."

In an instant he was on his feet and looking angrily about him. "I have told you that there must be the utmost quiet—no agitation of the child." He moved quickly towards the place from which the sharp, moaning cry had come. As he threw the door open he saw two hands shielding a woman's face, and on one of

the hands was a ring of peculiar form. His eyes seemed to regard only that; then he quietly closed the door.

"But that is auntie. You mustn't scold auntie; I won't love you if you do; I won't come back to comfort you. I'll tell auntie you are sorry that you scolded her, and then she will come and comfort you when I am gone."

Truer prophet than you could know yourself to be, dear heart.

"And a little child shall lead them."

Sooner than she had anticipated the crisis had come; and it had found her utterly unprepared to meet it, eagerly as she had longed for the consummation. But she recalled the Man's words: "Sincere contrition will be all the more irresistible, if channeled in a dignified sense of the claims of your womanhood."

Never before had she sought to make her charms so winning, for never before had such momentous issues been at stake. For the first time in her life she was captive to fear. Not fear that her contrition would be repelled. She had no dread of any immediate humiliation. It was in the beyond, the great beyond of all her future, where lay the dread of lapsing back into the old life which now had become so

hateful to her, because now her whole being was hungering for his love.

"To agonize in prayer." She recalled how, in her splendid vitality, in that self-reliant independence with which a loveless soul can survey all emotion, she had regarded, with something akin to contempt, the weakness which could bow in such self-abasement. And now, to her heart untrained in prayer, there could come—through her sense of utter estrangement from the Divine love—only the agonizing, none of the loving, restful trust in the divine strength to supplement her weakness—weakness all the more overpowering because it had entered a soul untried, undisciplined, in sorrow.

Endless seemed the hours till they should meet at the dinner-table.

She was careful to enter the dining-room first, and seated herself so that she need not look into his face when he entered.

She did not dare to trust her forced composure to bear such a test. She felt—so intensely acute was every sense—rather than heard, his eager approach.

He came behind her and laid his hands on her shoulders and said: "Has it been all a dream—only an ugly dream?"

"No, it has not been a dream. It has been

a hard, cruel reality. But that woman is dead. I despise her memory. If years of loving devotion can blot her baseness out of your memory I will give you that."

She was tempted to cover her face and go down on her knees and ask his forgiveness. But she remembered the Man's advice.

She rose and turned statelily to him with graceful, outstretched arms; her white bosom heaving, her snowy shoulders glistening, her head thrown back, displaying ivory throat, while half-closed, ravishing eyes, and lips moulded in expectancy of kisses completed the grace that waited on the penitence which she brought to him—penitence none the less sincere because she made her grace its ally.

She wound the shapely arms about him and drew him to her. "It shall always be leap year in my heart, and I will woo you as sincerely as you did me in the years ago. Then a heartless woman took your heart and did not give you hers in return; yet she had none then to give. Oh, my darling, that woman wasn't I. Think of her as dead; as someone I never even knew. She is not worthy of thought, of even contempt from you. But I come to you unsullied. In all these years I have not had one sentiment of friendship for any other man. I admired you, and

you alone; and yet it was a man who revealed to me my better self. I will tell it all to you; some time when you hold me in your arms."

He looked down at her, smilingly. "How easy it is to forgive a handsome woman. But if that awful woman is dead, and this beautiful creature that I am entrapped by is to be my wife, then we must be publicly joined. So, as it is Sunday to-morrow, we will go to church together, and thus, before all the world, I will take you as my wife."

She kissed him her thanks for the delicate consideration that prompted him to thus demand from all of his friends their recognition of her as once more his wife.

"You are a charming bride this morning." A deeper colour came in acknowledgment of his admiration, As they walked together she was eager to see that every one observed that she was again his wife. Yet she wished to be constantly looking into his face.

You have seen the same delightful failure to do both successfully, when the mother of a young hero takes him out to show the world that it was she who bore him and tended him and taught him to be noble.

At the church door he left her, promising to join her as soon as a pressing call was answered.

He thought it wisest that she should not see again that dear child, whose now glazing eyes and pains of dissolution would displace the memory of the sweet face which smiled so tenderly, as the thin lips told her : " He is sorry that he was cross to you, auntie, and he is so lonely ; he has no one to love him, and you must go and comfort him after I am gone. Oh, he is so kind."

Later, when the child rested as if in sleep among flowers that lay on soft clouds of mist-like mull, he brought her to see its sweet repose. Then she took her husband's hand, and in her heart she said again—and this time so sincerely —the obligations of the marriage service.

For once the Man was wrong. The woman whom he had made his confidante had fallen in love with her husband : and the Man himself had wrought the undoing of his theory.

XVI

At first, the end seemed so far away that the vista appeared to be interminable. But at length by years the prisoner counted no longer ; for months were the milestones that marked the dreary procession of prison life.

And when there came the time when only

weeks intervened between him and freedom, his heart grew lighter day by day.

When he was ready to leave the prison there was given to him a package. It contained a letter of advice, which urged him not to return immediately to his old home, but to visit some large city: to see everything that was bright and entertaining there, so that he might have pleasant topics of conversation when he returned to his wife. It advised him to dress well, "for a man does not respect himself if he is not well dressed." The writer kindly omitted "when he has nothing within himself to respect."

The package contained sufficient money to enable him to avail himself of the advice.

It was sent from the city of his disgrace, and there was no signature to the letter.

He immediately wrote his thanks to the men who had effected his ruin. They concluded that it was best not to acknowledge his gratitude.

He wrote to his wife, telling her of their generosity and thoughtful suggestions. She had already written to him, telling him to come to her, and that he would have a cordial welcome.

But in that home cheeks had grown paler, and lips more firmly pressed, as the time

for the parting approached. Yet this only in aloneness. In each other's presence each bore a brave front, and with each the sorrow was hidden, that it might not bring keener pain to the other.

When only the last few days of the home life remained, it was noticeable how much of his work the Man found he could do at home; how frequently he needed her advice.

At length there came the last evening before his long-deferred journey was begun.

In his constant thoughtfulness he had recognized that a week of aloneness would make the husband's home-coming more welcome to the wife, her greeting more sincere and cordial. But she was too oppressed to recognize this consideration. She had hoped that on this last evening he would tell her—in words that even in their calm constraint would show his pain—of the loneliness to which he looked forward, when he had returned and found her gone; would tell her of the joy she had brought to his life, of the great void that her absence would create—and for which nothing could compensate.

Just like any other evening it passed, till she, weary of waiting for the words she would have treasured, made excuse and went to her own room.

There her disappointment and vexation found relief in tears, which only displaced these sorrows by bringing keener pain. Being a woman, she put the worst possible construction on his reticence, now that she had grown morbid in her tears and solitary brooding.

It was all plain to her now. He had expressed no sorrow because he felt none. He did not like to be alone. That was why he had welcomed her. He would miss her for a time, but probably he already had found someone else who would make his home just as bright.

And she reasoned like a real woman : because she admired him, every other woman would be glad to fill the place she was vacating.

Not till early dawn did she fall asleep ; and as the day was opening there came a faint knock at her door and she heard the rustle of a note passing over the threshold.

Her heart was too weary to regard these noises, till a moment later she heard the outer door close, and she saw him passing down the street. She watched him till he passed out of sight. Then—having actually seen him alone ; no evidence of that dreaded woman near him —by some principle of induction which no man can understand, she dismissed her gloomy forebodings and opened the note.

In it he begged her to regard his last request. He told her of the comfort it would be to him in his loneliness, to feel that she had left the room with every possible evidence remaining in it that she had occupied it.

He begged her to arrange nothing; to leave it exactly as this note found it; to take her little ornaments, but to leave, just as it happened to lie, everything that was associated with their last evening together; then to lock the room and place the key in her safe drawer, adding: "And neither room nor drawer will be opened till you return—some time within three years. Till then, let me feel that your room is in the charming disorder of the impress of your presence—just as if you had left it for a moment's absence."

She regarded his wish. Now she knew that the indifference at parting was not real; that it veiled regrets that could not be expressed under the strange conditions of their leave-taking.

At the breakfast-table she found another letter. It told her to go with her husband to the metropolis; to make themselves so well acquainted with its principal streets and buildings that they could claim that city as their home.

"Be sure to be able to speak intelligently of the theatres; of the churches you will probably be little questioned. You will take the name we decided it was best for you to assume. When ready, go to San Francisco. I enclose the card of my attorney there. He will give you the directions for reaching the ranch which I will have arranged for your occupancy—leased with opportunity to purchase. You will recognize that it is located so that there is no danger of meeting old acquaintances." Then there followed earnest assurances of the sorrow it would give to him, if any need came—or even any opportunity for enjoyment—and she did not avail herself of the means that would be always at her command.

When her husband came to her she showed him this letter. Dead to honour, he felt no humiliation that one who had saved his wife from want and from reflected shame should thus provide for his comfort—thus providing because his life was indissolubly bound up with his wife's happiness.

On the other hand, she asked to see the letter which had come to him in the prison. She glanced at it hastily, then, forcing a composure, she asked with assumed indifference: "May I have it and keep it?" She took it and hid

herself. When she reappeared her eyes had marks of tears and much of the letter was illegible. "Dear heart, did you think I wouldn't find you in every line of this? Did you suppose your tender thoughtfulness could be hidden from me? Poor sinner; let him think it was done for his sake. But that big, loving heart was regarding me, only me, when this was written. It was all for my sake."

When at last she was leaving home, and with her husband had reached the street door, she returned alone to her former room, and fastened on the door a card. Its inscription was:

"Bluebeard's
Chamber of Horrors."

"There now; if that dreadful woman should come, she will be just dying with curiosity to know what it means—and he won't dare tell her. And maybe then she will be jealous. Wish I could see his face when he reads it."

Nearly three years have passed. Even the balmy air of Southern California could not bring a healthful glow to the cheeks which were whitened with more than prison pallor. The prison physicians were correct. "Not more than three years of freedom can come to him—in this world."

As the end drew nearer, and the strength of manhood faded into the weakness of childhood, that which might have developed into true manliness displayed itself. Like a little child he pleaded for forgiveness, and asked her to teach him to crave pardon from the Judge, whom he feared might not regard his sin with the same leniency which she had bestowed. Asking only for tenderness to an erring child, it was easy to give him the affection due to a repentant child, and so, in peace, his life ended.

"Within three years. You were right. May I come?"—so ran the telegram.

And when she comes, and they look into each other's faces, each heart vibrant with fear and with loving expectancy—fear that the years may have made the other's heart less constant to the old faithfulness—and she receives again the keys, in token that she is again the mistress of the home; and she leads him to the "chamber of horrors" and shows him its disorder, on which the gathered dust is evidence of how sacredly the lares and penates have kept the place in a seclusion devoted to her memory, then—

Will the dignified serenity of the old life be resumed? Will there still abide the old faith in each other, which existed unquestioningly,

because there was no right to resent a fancied violation of any pledge? Will each have no secrets from the other, because neither will be oppressed by the thought that each has the legal right to look into the other's thoughts? Will there be the same generous giving of self, because the giving was wholly a free gift—no right to demand? And, most of all, will there be the old-time thoughtful courtesy which power delights to banish?

Or, will they go the way of the world; each to be reduced to a fraction of two; sacrificing that noblest condition—a self-poised, self-controlled individuality?

If it is this, may it be vouchsafed that a little child may lead them; its tiny hands blinding them to the vista of the dignity and devotion of the old life.

Let us now regard the evidences of Paul's insanity; the evidences contained in the manuscript which the clergyman declined to consider.

In a spirit of candid inquiry—by no means comprehensively, but in the hope of suggesting scientific examination—the author presents these views to skilled alienists, hoping that they can differentiate the indications of insanity and state whether the morbid condition of Paul's mind, when he approaches the subject of sex, was a primary condition of his insanity, or was the result of insanity otherwise established.

XVII

"The woman . . . tempted me."

"And Adam was not deceived; but the woman being (thoroughly) deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding, she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in
1 Tim. ii. 14, 15. faith and charity and holiness, with sobriety."

Would that Saul of Tarsus had shown no graver evidence of a disordered mind than is indicated by this confusing change from the singular to the plural—a plural which cannot include the husband; since her salvation cannot be contingent on his joining her in practising the virtues named.

But let us consider the import of these sentences.

The inference naturally drawn from the first proposition is: Adam was not in the transgression; and the consequent conclusion is, that Adam was unjustly driven from the Garden.

But how preposterous is the second statement! Surely no sane mind would thus imply the exclusion of childless wives and unmarried women from the saving power of the Christ.

But if we insist that Paul was inspired, "what further need have we of witnesses" to the beneficence of Mormonism efforts for the salvation of women? How heroic, truly so, become the sacrifices of the fading wives, who are supplanted; since the souls of those who supplant "shall be saved in child-bearing," while the men who thus assume the added responsibilities must no longer be regarded as selfishly seeking their own pleasure, but are ministers of grace to women, who would remain in the transgression of Eve if these men did not open to them the gates of heaven through conferred maternity.

If a wholly artificial yet conveniently arbitrary meaning is given to these words, and it is assumed that "child-bearing" refers to the incarnation of the Christ, there can be shown no appositeness in their application to women only: while the discrimination against woman, as shown in the first sentence, makes it improbable that the leading thought in Paul's mind was of the incarnation.

But further on we find the impelling sentiment of this denunciation of woman. For the prurient imagination, which Paul shows in his commands in regard to the care of widows, is

1 Tim. v. 3-16.

accompanied by the further evidence

of that cultivated contempt for women which manifests itself so often in his writings.

No sane or pure mind could have written: "But the younger widows refuse (to relieve?); for when they begin to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith." Surely such neglect and sweeping denunciation would be an incentive to wantonness.

So, too, is his bitter denunciation of widows of any age under sixty years.

However, when another mood possesses him, 1 Cor. vii. 39. he says: "But if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord."

Again: his morbid imagination is exhibited. 1 Cor. xi. 2-16. "But every woman praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head. For this cause ought a woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels." It is hard for a sane mind to discover a reason why the angels should be disturbed if a woman was not veiled, though it is easy enough to fabricate fanciful explanations.

He adds: "For the man is not of the woman but the woman of the man," and a few verses later he says: "For as the woman is of the man, so is also the man by the woman." A

senseless attempt to depreciate womanhood.

1 Cor. xiv. 34-36. Supercilious as he was towards the law, he does not hesitate to quote the law when he desires to express his contempt for women ; a contempt which is expressed in scorn and sarcasm at the close of this quotation..

In these disdainful expressions he shows an estimate of womanhood which is so thoroughly at variance with the language and actions of our Lord that—if we accept Paul's language as authoritative, his sentiments as just—we must recognize that our Lord was strangely ignorant of the true character of the sex.

In striking contrast is St Peter's delicacy and his respect for women, when he refers to marital obligations, and to the proper conduct of married women ; thus showing that Paul's coarseness was inherent with himself—not demanded in rebuke—and St Peter's intercourse with the Gentiles seems to have been nearly as great as was Paul's.

Rather, let us regard Paul's utterances as indicating a soul which had vainly attempted to discipline itself out of the realm of natural affection, but had produced a diseased intellect — that saddest form of mental obliquity which refracts any impulse into the plane of demonstrated truth ; and permits the end

to justify the means in producing a desired conviction.

Rom. i. 24. Even more convincing is the revolting account which Paul gives of the sensuality of unbelievers.

While it may be a truthful picture of their degradation, it has no appositeness here. He opens the chapter by praising the faith of the church at Rome; he acknowledges the purity of the lives of those whom he addresses, with whom he hopes to "be comforted by the mutual faith, both of you and me." Only a morbid imagination, directing a mind which had become unsound, could have introduced this repugnant description — a description wholly foreign to the conditions which he was regarding—and there is nothing to indicate that he intended it as a warning.

Rom. ii. 1. And although he says, "Thou doest the same things," he has clearly indicated that in this he was denouncing idolaters; for there is no evidence that the revolting picture Rom. i. 23. which he drew was in any way applicable to particular members of the Church at Rome; which, in its entirety, he had commended so warmly.

None of the other New Testament writers—nor all—found it necessary to consider conditions incident to sex to the extent that Paul has

1 Cor. vii. done in a single chapter. This chapter is clearly the product of a mind which has given undue thought to sexual relations; which is fascinated by the contemplation of tendencies which he counsels superiority to. Yet even this fascination cannot long restrain that erratic thought which is a consequent of Verses 18-24. insanity. For he here digresses; only to be dominated, towards the end of the chapter, by the same morbid impulses which directed its first half.

The contradictions of an unbalanced mind 1 Cor. xi. 5. are shown by his giving permission to women to pray or prophesy—evidently in xiv. 34. public gatherings; but soon he says: "Let your women keep silence in the churches," and there seems to have been no lapse of time to permit his opinion to be changed by further experience.

1 Cor. vi. 12-15. Most difficult of all of Paul's writings I conceive these verses to be. First he states that "all things are lawful for me." But there closely follows it such reference to sexual impurity, and there precedes it a recounting of grosser forms of impurity, so that one is perplexed in trying to fathom his intent in associating the comprehensive "all," in stating what is allowable for him to do, when his mind is dwelling emphatically on sexual relations.

But what apology, other than insanity, can be offered for the next verse? That would seem to be the only excuse for the strange perversion of the words of our Lord. He
Matt. xix. 5. says: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall become one flesh." But Paul says: "Know ye not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? for the twain, saith He, shall be one flesh." Had any one but Paul thus misquoted the words of our Lord, we would have called it blasphemy. Paul's clouded, yet arrogant, intellect made him indifferent to the perverting of our Lord's language. But this degrading of His utterances turned a phrase in a way that satisfied the moment, and Paul was indifferent to the sacrilege.

In his old age, in captivity, perhaps broken, he writes the beautiful appeal to the Galatians. And here he gives, in its truth, the quotation from our Lord: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh."

This recurrence to the true quotation of our Lord's words, shows that the blasphemous
1 Cor. vi. 16. paraphrasing of them was not made through ignorance.

So intent are you theologians in maintaining your fetish of St Paul that you refuse to recognize that which was hardly less blasphemous —but for the charitable view that he was of unsound mind—yet liable to do more harm; that is Paul's overriding of our Lord's restrictions on divorce. For Paul made feasible almost any divorce by mutual consent, when he counselled those to separate who merely held diverse religious opinions. Unconsciously Paul reveals here, as so often, his inability—or his indifference—to presenting more than a single aspect of important considerations.

More than that; he gives us additional evidence of how little he recognized, or sympathized with, our Lord's love and tender thoughtfulness for children. Our Lord's narrowing of cause for divorce was a safeguard for children. Paul had little of tender
1 Cor. vii. 15-16. regard for the claims of childhood. Hence he sanctioned divorce for a cause which would work incalculable harm to children.

And in the following verse he justifies such separation, simply because there was no certainty that patient effort to convert the unbeliever would be the result of continuing in "the duty nearest at hand," and so the most incumbent duty.

Naturally we find that twice he gives himself precedence to our Lord, in "My gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ"; yet the precedence might not be so clear in its intent but for its

1 Cor. v. 5. third instance: "Ye being gathered together and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh." Although this may be softened in translation, it does not qualify Paul's arrogance in his claiming a power to command the aid of our Lord to deliver the offender to Satan.

The easy and confidential relations which he seems to have established with Satan are

1 Tim. i. 20. further shown in: "Of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander, whom I delivered unto Satan that they might be taught not to blaspheme." His ability to command the exercise of divine wrath is asserted equally with his claim to possess the power to employ Satan as an administrator of discipline.

Gal. i. 8. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema."

Evidently Paul had learned to "sow beside all waters."

And again he says:

2 Tim. xi. 8. "Remember that Jesus Christ was

raised from the dead according to my gospel."

Rom. ii. 16. "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." His intense egotism is illustrated in each of the above instances.

1 Cor. xv. 28. The inferiority of the Son to the Father is so emphatically stated, that he practically denies again the positive teaching of our Lord: "I and my Father are one." But as Paul seems to have been granted a special licence for blasphemy, orthodox theology compels us to accept as truth these dicta of Paul.

1 Cor. vi. 2, 3. "Or know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? Know ye not that ye shall judge angels?"

Could insane egotism lead to a greater presumption in assuming a knowledge of God's plans? And we must remember that this was in the face of our Lord's statements that He would judge the world.

What was Paul's authority that God's scriptural plan of governing man—a plan so carefully elaborated—was not only an utter failure but inherently so? He calls its

2 Cor. iii. 7. commandments "the ministration of death." Only the reckless temerity of a disordered mind, imbued with arrogance, would have impelled to such characterizing of the

law—viz., that its failure was inevitable and predestined. This theory, so boldly assumed, he attempts to vindicate by: "It was added
Gal. iii. 9. because of transgression;" a statement which admits of such varied interpretations that it does not explain.

1 Cor. xv. 10. Boastfully he says: "But I laboured more abundantly than they all" (the twelve apostles); and later implies that this "more abundantly" was because God's grace was bestowed on him with a fulness which exceeded that which was bestowed on all of the twelve.

2 Cor xi. 15; xii. 11.* Here, as elsewhere, he parades his sense of equality with the other apostles; and in this epistle there are frequently recurring "vain repetitions" of his obtrusive self-exaltation, which he develops rather than conceals by his attempt to veneer it with assumed humility.

Paul made a statement directly opposed to the account given in Acts, of his conference with the apostles, and of that which led up to it.

Practically, too, he denies St Peter's call to apostleship to the Gentiles: the call that was

* Fruitful as were the so-called Pauline churches—"the garden of Christianity"—we must not forget the devoted services of others, who are significantly suggested in his "all that are in Asia are turned against me."

so clearly made through the vision of the great sheet let down by the four corners. We must reject one side of this evidence. They are so antagonistic that we cannot accept both as true.

His writings bristle with the capital I; and he describes general tendencies of the race as if they were peculiarly personal to himself; so strongly does self-consciousness overpower him.

1 Cor. ix. This is a marked illustration of the egotism that often accompanies mental aberration.

"The complex relations of faith, works, imputed righteousness, and the law as the revealer of sin, gave to Paul that opportunity for the display of scholastic reasoning in which he so thoroughly delighted, for the sake of its intellectual exercise, and which has a glittering semblance of truth in monologue, though in pure polemics its lapse from accurate reasoning, its false deductions, its assumed premises, would be exposed before his ingenious conclusions had carried conviction."

"One phase of his intense self-absorption is shown in the inappositeness of his quotations from the Scriptures. It could not be from ignorance that he failed to quote them pertinently. That he had them in mind is evident,

for he was constantly denouncing the law, and the denunciatory passages would have eminently attracted him." But his thoughts were so self-centred that he must have been as averse to the guidance of the Scriptures as he was eager to boast that he was in no way indebted to the chosen of our Lord.

Only a mind which was so unbalanced that it delighted to reason from distorted truths or from false premises, could have presented the
Rom. vi. 1-15. proposition: "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" "Shall we sin because we are not under law, but under grace?" And even these propositions are
Verse 20. illogical deductions from the evidently false premises, that the law was promulgated, not to be the "schoolmaster to lead us to Christ," but to intensify the sinfulness of sin—or whatever Paul may have meant by "that the offence may abound." Here, for the sake of creating an illustration, he does not hesitate to attribute an arbitrary and unnatural motive, when he refers to God's inscrutable plan of revealing His will in the Mosaic dispensation.

Rambling, discursive, disjointed, his thoughts run.

He abruptly drops the subject under con-

sideration and takes up a new and totally unconnected thought; but presently—and as abruptly as he changed—he returns to the previous thought. He lays down certain propositions and elaborates them. Then he propounds an entirely new thesis and goes on to argue from it; as if it had been demonstrated by the previous reasoning—though in no way deducible from that which precedes.

One of the most serious of his lapses from accuracy is shown in: "For all the law is fulfilled in this. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The love to God omitted; as only an unbalanced mind could forget to include. And it was Christian duty he was exemplifying—not contrasting it with the Mosaic law.

Gal. v. 14.

All these instances are proofs of a disordered mind; as is also Paul's manifestations of that intense egotism which always attends certain forms of mental aberration. It is this which leads him to employ, so largely, the first person singular,—even where a general or impersonal proposition makes it inappropriate to thus introduce his own personality.

And this egotism takes a form more repugnant—though none the less indicative of his character—in his expressions of contempt for

the twelve apostles, and in his claim of a direct "revelation by Jesus Christ."

Gal. ii. 2-14. Here his sense of superiority to, and his contempt for, the twelve is again clearly shown; and he boasts that he publicly de-

Verses 20-21. nounced Peter; then extols his own righteousness.

In marked contrast was St Peter's charitable construction of Paul's language; and also the care which the apostles took to save Paul from the violence of the Jews in Jerusalem.

His intense intellectual pride impels him to attempt scholastic argument. But the results

Rom. v. 12-21 and vii. 7-25. are illogical and involved, the thought becomes confused, the argument ceases to be sustained and coherent—conclusive evidences of a distraught mind. Only such a mind could have conceived: "For the creation was sub-

Rom. viii. 20-21. ject to vanity; not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the liberty," etc., etc. Now the consequent "in hope," etc., is utterly senseless. To say that "the creation was subject to vanity" "in the hope that it shall be delivered" is thoroughly unmeaning. In Paul's distraught mind there was an intermediate idea. But the flaccid will

—which is a marked feature of insanity—failing to control the vagaries of his thought, allowed the conjunctive phrase to be expelled from its place and to be forgotten. This lapse may have been ; *nevertheless it continued* "in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered." The observant reader will find repeated instances of such lapses.

Later on in Romans, his erratic attempts at reasoning are exhibited, in his stating that the law cannot give to man power to lead a new life. It commands, yet it is not attended with power to induce obedience ; implying that man had not been divinely endued with power to obey the commands laid upon him ; and he teaches that, although good in itself, the law has only a pernicious effect, since it incites to sinful desires. The conclusion is directly opposed to the premises.

Rom. ix.-xi. It is Israel's own fault to have rejected salvation ; on the other hand it was God's will that it do so. No sane mind would introduce such inconsistency of statement.

He states that Israel is at present rejected in order that place might be made for the heathen. But by this admission of the heathen, Israel is to be stirred to jealousy. But he gives no reason why the saving grace

is not so vast that Jews and Gentiles could not have received it simultaneously.

From a sane mind these statements would be blasphemous claims of familiarity with God's purposes. Yet they are of value as showing that Paul was always at heart a Pharisee, unable to free himself from the rabbinical conception of God's arbitrariness; and, as a consequence, clearly proving that he had neither the intellectual perception nor the spiritual insight to recognize the true motive of the divine sacrifice.

Observe his long sentences; with attempts at illustration and explanation by interjected matter; but which new matter is often discovered to be a new proposition; and not till we have traversed laboriously these intermediate ideas, do we find the conclusions of his original propositions.

Such lapses and irrelevant additions plainly indicate a disordered mind, unable to maintain continuous and logically-developed reasoning.

He gives us another instance of this. "But
Gal. iii. 23. before faith came we were kept in ward under the law; shut up unto the faith which should be afterwards revealed. So that the law hath been our tutor to bring us to Christ"; not regarding that—in Romans—he has taught that the law has a pernicious effect,

and incites to evil desires. A few verses later he changes the figure, and makes the world—not the law—the power which restrains us. "So we also, when we were children, were held in bondage under the rudiments of the world," till the coming of Christ. But he has previously said: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse."

Gal. iii. 10.

While many a schoolboy thinks that his "tutor" is a "curse," it is preposterous to assume that any sane reasoner could argue that a "curse" could be "our tutor to bring us to Christ." No stretch of poetic licence, nor fine distinctions between the "law" and "the works of the law," can excuse these extravagances; nor permit these impulsive utterances to be dignified with the authority of inspired truth. No well-balanced mind could fail to recognize the incongruity of naming "the rudiments of the world" and the "curse of the works of law" as wholesome and disciplinary influences to prepare the "children" to attain the freedom of majority in Christ.

Most noticeable is his very frequent repetition of the word "for," as if desiring to establish the conclusions of previous propositions; yet those previous propositions having no connection with assumed deductions.

Instances illustrating every phase of Paul's

morbid and distraught mind are so numerous that it is needless to quote them. But the reader who encounters them in a spirit of candid inquiry cannot but recognize that Paul's unbalanced mind led him to believe that there were natural sequence of ideas, where in reality his assumed conclusions had no relation to his premises. There is a marked illustration of these vagaries—which shows, too, that even Paul recognized how little reliance could be placed on claims of special revelation, as evidence of inspiration — but otherwise it is senseless; compelling the reader to indulge in arbitrary inferences as to the meaning of "prize" and "voluntary" and "worshipping of angels"; and by filling any hiatus from his own fancy. "Let no man rob you of your prize, by a voluntary humility, worshipping of angels, *dwelling in the things which he hath seen*, vainly puffed up in his fleshly mind."

Col. ii. 18, 19.

If sufficient evidence has not been presented to illustrate that Paul's claims to divine inspiration were utterly without foundation, let us revert to the opening of this chapter.

"Adam was not deceived." The inevitable conclusion is, Adam was not in the transgression.

1 Cor. xv. 22. But Paul says: "As in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive." The first part of the latter quotation is wholly irreconcilable with the previous quotation; while the universality of Christ's salvation, which the last part of the latter quotation clearly asserts, is thoroughly at variance with the limitation of God's grace in Christ Jesus which Paul defines elsewhere.

Rom. ix. 18. "So then he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth."

Rom. xi. 5, 7, 8. "Even so then, at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace . . . but the election obtained it and the rest were hardened. . . . God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear."

An interesting side-light is thrown on Paul's

1 Cor. ix. 10. character: "Is it for the oxen God careth, or saith he it for your sakes? Yea, for your sakes it was written." Whereas our Lord had plainly shown the Divine love and care for all of His creatures—even for the "two sparrows sold for a farthing."

But Paul desired to make a striking contrast, and was—as so often—indifferent to fact.

Was it the same recklessness of statement—

or was it ignorance of arboriculture—which led him to use the figure of grafting a branch of a wild olive tree into a good olive tree—the result of which would be to make the latter valueless?

"QUOD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM."

EDINBURGH
COLSTONS LIMITED
PRINTERS

234 R
S089

Southworth, H.W.

Divine love vindicated.

234 R
S089